

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 215--81st Congress

Chapter 407--1st Session

H. J. Res. 327

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Digest of Public Law 215	1
Index and Summary of History of H. J. Res. 327	1

DICEST OF PUBLIC LAW 215

APPROPRIATION, INSECT CONTROL. Appropriates an additional amount for "Control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases" for grasshopper control in several western states.

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF HISTORY OF H. J. RES. 327

- July 26, 1949 Hearings: House, H. J. Res. 327.
- July 27, 1949 H. J. Res. 327 was introduced by Rep. Ferr and was referred to the House Committee on Appropriations. Print of the measure as reported.
- House Committee reported H. J. Res. 327 without amendment. House Report 1132. Print of the measure as reported.
- House debated and passed H. J. Res. 327 as reported.
- July 28, 1949 Senate Committee on Appropriations reported H. J. Res. 327 with amendments. Senate Report 794. Print of the measure as reported.
- Senate debated and passed H. J. Res. 327 as reported.
- Senate Conference appointed.
- August 1, 1949 House conferees appointed.
- August 3, 1949 House and Senate agreed to the conference report. House Report 1166.
- August 8, 1949 Approved. Public Law 215.

CONTROL OF EMERGENCY OUTBREAKS OF INSECTS AND PLANT DISEASES

HEARINGS
BEFORE THE
**SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**
EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION
ON
**CONTROL OF EMERGENCY OUTBREAKS OF
INSECTS AND PLANT DISEASES!**

Printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1949

application. We normally distribute five pounds of the new type bait per acre when the population of grasshoppers is about 35 per square yard. The populations have been so high, however, that in many, many areas we have to double the bait application to 10 pounds per acre, and in some places the farmers have been putting out 40 pounds per acre. That is not because of the inefficiency of the bait, but because of the number of grasshoppers that are there to eat the bait.

All that has been part of the situation that developed since the first deficiency appropriation was made available on the 24th day of May. You recall there was quite a difference of timing from the time your committee considered it until the bill became law. We have been carrying on, because of this infestation, the program at a vigorous rate. We believe the appropriation for "Incipient emergencies" is just what the title indicates—to meet emergencies as emergencies arise—and when they come, that is the way we have been handling expenditures under the funds that are available.

In late June, we recognized the situation and realized the amount that would be carried in the 1950 Appropriation Act would be inadequate to meet the situation. So we presented an estimate to the Bureau of the Budget, and on the 5th day of July we appeared before the Budget to defend that item, and on the 7th the President submitted direct to the Senate an estimate requesting an appropriation of \$3,500,000. That is what we are here to talk about now.

You will find the President's statement indicated if we continued this program we would be out of money at the end of July.

A week ago I appeared before the Senate committee considering the third deficiency appropriation bill. I tried to point out the situation to them at that time, and subsequently the Department has written to the chairman of the Senate committee urging that this matter be given careful consideration. I believe that is the reason we have an opportunity to appear before your group this afternoon, to tell you what the situation is.

FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR CURRENT CROP YEAR

Mr. CANNON. How much money have you had, Doctor, for this crop year, up to this time?

Dr. ROHWER. For the crop year, Mr. Cannon, we had \$1,250,000 carried in the first deficiency. That became available on the 24th day of May, and we have had \$1,500,000 that is carried in the Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1950 under that item, which makes \$2,750,000.

Mr. CANNON. You have had no other funds from any other source except that \$2,750,000?

Dr. ROHWER. That is all as far as the Federal side goes. Of course, we have had funds from the States in cooperation with us.

Mr. CANNON. The States have contributed?

Dr. ROHWER. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. What States have contributed?

Dr. ROHWER. Montana and Wyoming so far have passed legislation that provided appropriations—\$90,000 in one case and \$110,000 in the other—but conditioned on that amount being matched by the counties and, furthermore, to be matched with money provided through the Federal appropriation.

Mr. CANNON. To what extent has it been matched?

Dr. ROHWER. It has been matched 100 percent. In addition to that in the area outside of where the population was believed to be the highest, the individual ranchmen have been using bait and have been spending 24 cents an acre to bait their ranch lands with contract planes. That is over and above this matching of the over-all appropriation.

Mr. CANNON. What do you estimate to be the full amount spent by the States?

Dr. ROHWER. By the States and cooperators, I do not have a very firm figure at this time, because we are moving so rapidly, but I think it would be in the general neighborhood of about \$950,000 since the 1st of June until the present time as the State and county expenditures, plus private owners' expenditures. I am speaking there solely of the situation in the area where this grasshopper infestation is so heavy, in the range lands of Montana and Wyoming.

Of course, grasshoppers have been bad in other parts of the United States where we have been carrying on the type of program where we furnish the bait and they do the mixing, distribution, and local handling.

Mr. CANNON. But you have had no direct appropriations by the State legislatures in any States except Montana and Wyoming?

Dr. ROHWER. No; there is none at the present time, with this exception, Congressman Cannon: the State of Arizona has about completed or the Governor has about released \$100,000 to carry on a cooperative program in the southeastern part of Arizona where the infestation is heavy, over about 150,000 acres. That does not have to be treated until about the middle of August, and they are preparing themselves to match the work there. But we cannot do that, of course, unless we have additional money.

As far as I know—and I had a message from the field in reference to that on Friday of last week—the Governor has on his desk an order to release from their pest control funds \$100,000 to plan for that campaign in southeastern Arizona.

Mr. CANNON. Well, the Federal funds up to this time have been \$2,800,000; you are asking \$3,500,000. That would make—

Dr. ROHWER. \$5,300,000.

Mr. TABER. It would make more than that.

Dr. ROHWER. It would make \$6,300,000.

Mr. CANNON. Not including the State moneys. Would you say that was a dollar a grasshopper, Doctor?

Dr. ROHWER. No; not by a long shot. By distributing 600 tons of bait in a heavily infested area out there, we are now killing 6,000 tons of grasshoppers a day.

IMPORTANCE OF DESTROYING THE GRASSHOPPERS

Mr. CANNON. What would be the effect if you did not kill these grasshoppers?

Dr. ROHWER. They would destroy the range lands, Mr. Cannon. In addition to that, the adjacent crop lands and, with these high populations, they would move from that area into the Dakotas to the east, Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, to the south, and perhaps as far south as Texas.

Mr. CANNON. When did you begin this grasshopper campaign?

Dr. ROHWER. We started to control grasshoppers on this type of basis along in 1931, I believe, Congressman Cannon. We had appropriation language that authorized this work, then the over-all authorization act was passed, I believe, in 1937. We had a few campaigns earlier than that, before we had this over-all authorizing legislation.

Mr. CANNON. You also started on the present scale in 1937?

Dr. ROHWER. Yes—or a little earlier than that. I did not bring that full table going back to the appropriation authorization.

The biggest outbreak we have had in grasshoppers was one in the early 1930's, in 1932, 1933, and 1934, when grasshopper infestation had boiled out, if you will, from this area in Montana and Wyoming and spread over about 24 of the Western States. We cannot say that is exactly what this will do; we can only say that is what history has indicated it has done in the past. The early outbreaks of 1860, 1864, and 1865 and again those along in 1888 and thereabouts all had their genesis in this area of range land in Montana and Wyoming, from flights leaving those areas.

At the present time, grasshoppers are adult in parts of those areas where we have not controlled them by baiting. Yesterday I talked with Mr. Lee Popham, who was out there, and he says they are milling around—that is his expression and our common expression to indicate they are getting restless—and just as soon as they destroy a little more range grass, that milling around will become flights, and, when they start to fly, this particular species which we call the *Mexicanus* may fly hundreds of miles. In the 1930's and thereabouts, we had marked grasshoppers fly over 350 miles. They left parts of Wyoming, and we picked them up in the Dakotas to the east, in Canada to the north, and in one case in Colorado a short distance below Colorado Springs. So we do have evidence that these grasshoppers do move long distances when they start flights.

Mr. CANNON. Will the application of this poison under your present program absolutely stop those flights or prevent those flights?

Dr. ROHWER. If we can get the poison there in time to kill the grasshoppers, we will stop the flights. With the early baiting we did at the beginning of the season when the grasshoppers were small and just hatching out of the eggs, we got a 98 percent kill practically all the time. But as the hoppers became larger and before we increased the rate of application, the kills fell off, and in some of those areas we had to go back and rebait, and a wire that came in this morning indicated the kills we are getting now are well above 93 percent.

Mr. CANNON. But the money you are spending now is not as effective as the money you spent earlier in the season?

Dr. ROHWER. It costs more to kill big grasshoppers than it does little grasshoppers. It takes more bait.

EFFECTIVENESS OF GRASSHOPPER CONTROL PROGRAM

Mr. CANNON. You have testified frequently before this committee and also before the Committee on Agriculture for many years back that money spent in the campaign affected that season only; that there is no hope of extermination; that it had no effect upon the grasshopper crop in future years; that the only benefit we get out of our money that we spend now is protection of crops to that extent during the current season.

Dr. ROHWER. Congressman Cannon, if I left that impression, I am sorry, because that is not what I meant to say or what the facts are as we understand them. I have said over and over again we will not eradicate the grasshopper, but I have tried to make it clear that where we had a successful control program—and we have had many of them—we eliminated the grasshoppers from a commercially destructive point of view in those areas over a long period of years.

I made reference a few minutes ago to that Arizona situation. In substantially that same territory, if you look on the map—and it is substantially the same—7 years ago grasshoppers were destructive to the ranges in the southeastern part of Arizona. The control program we put on at that time in cooperation with the States—and they fully matched us—was so successful that there have been no grasshoppers of any consequence in that area in those 7 years. The farmers remember that; they recognize grasshoppers are now becoming abundant, and they want to repeat that.

I have told you of another time when we had an infestation of the long-wing grasshopper in southeastern Colorado and northeastern New Mexico and western Texas, where the States carried on a program and where the State of New Mexico at that time contributed \$95,000 for a control program, that the grasshopper has not reappeared; that the infestation has not reappeared since 1939.

Mr. CANNON. You tell us now that the infestation is worse than it has been for some years. Apparently, then, your campaign in the last 2 or 3 years has not been so effective?

Dr. ROHWER. Congressman Cannon, in the area where this infestation is building up, on ranges in Montana and Wyoming, we have never carried on an effort to knock down or to suppress that infestation. It has never been tried before.

Mr. CANNON. Do you mean to say, then, that it is your opinion that if sufficient bait were properly applied, you could exterminate the grasshopper permanently?

Dr. ROHWER. No, we could not exterminate those native insects. But if we knocked down this big infestation we feel very confident that the grasshoppers problem next summer will not be of the character it has been this year. We will have grasshoppers, but we will not have the grasshoppers over as widespread an area as we will have them if this infestation gets away from us.

AREA INVOLVED BY INFESTATION

Mr. CANNON. What is the area involved at this time?

Dr. ROHWER. I think I would do better if I tried to show these areas on a map, if you will bear with me. I have here a map of the United States divided into two parts. I shall talk first about the western part. The area that is cross-hatched in green, as you will see there, is practically the entire part of this area [indicating on map] where grasshoppers are more abundant, are building up. They are not destructive over all of that area and I do not want to leave that impression. But the problem is a big one.

These red cross-hatched areas cover northwestern Nevada, three spots in California, the southeast corner of Arizona, the Panhandle of Texas, western Kansas, eastern Colorado, and Nebraska. These spots up in northern Montana and in Kansas and in the upper part

of North Dakota are where the grasshoppers are in high population and will cause destruction and are causing destruction in those places where the control has not been applied to croplands.

Mr. CANNON. Doctor, all of that area that is affected, as shown on that map, is largely grassland, is it not?

Dr. ROHWER. A good deal of it is grassland.

Mr. CANNON. In other words, that is pasture land and it is not worth more than 15 cents an acre; and as the summer advances it all dies anyway, does it not?

Dr. ROHWER. No, it does not all die. The grass is—

Mr. CANNON. It becomes brown?

Dr. ROHWER. It becomes brown, but it still makes good feed when it is brown grass.

SAVINGS BY DESTROYING THE GRASSHOPPERS

Mr. CANNON. What are we saving, then, by destroying these grasshoppers, in terms of cash? You are asking us to permit you to spend \$6,300,000. Perhaps we are not saving \$3,000,000 worth of farm produce or \$3,000,000 worth of pasture grazing.

Dr. ROHWER. We have already saved more than that in crops that we have saved in areas in California and in areas up here in Montana.

Mr. CANNON. You speak of crops. Are you speaking of grass, Doctor?

Dr. ROHWER. This year's crops.

Mr. CANNON. It is my understanding that there you have crops, where the land is cultivated and crops are grown, the farmers themselves handle their own problem, as they do in the cottonfields in the South in connection with boll weevils, or the cornfields in the North in connection with the corn borer.

Dr. ROHWER. They handle their own problems where a community effort is not required. Where a community effort is required, we have been cooperating—

Mr. CANNON. What is the distinction between where a community effort is required and where it is not required?

Dr. ROHWER. For grasshopper control, in the current season, Congressman Cannon, community effort is required in all of these areas that are cross-hatched red, with the exception of this area in Illinois.

Sunday I talked with the State entomologist in Illinois and he said that with the exception of two counties—and they would be these that are under the lower mark here [indicating on map]—the farmers are going to be able to take care of the grasshoppers as they take care of other crop pests. But in those two counties, it is going to require cooperative effort and he will need some bait a little later in the season.

BREAK-DOWN OF FUNDS REQUEST

Mr. CANNON. Do you think, where that cooperative effort is required, that we are getting value received for the money that we spend? With reference to this \$6,300,000, is that all going to be spent for bait, or is it going to be spent for freight, or for personnel? How is that broken down?

Dr. ROHWER. It is spent for bait, bait materials, transportation of bait and bait materials, aircraft hire.

Mr. CANNON. The recipients do not pay the freight?

Dr. ROHWER. In these cropland areas we deliver the bait to a central spot. They take it from the central spot. They do not pay the transportation. We will pay it to the county seat, or some other central spot; we lay it down at a place and they unload the car and take it to the mixing stations and use it. Sometimes it may mean two or three cross-county hauls, because we do not always put it down in the county where the bait is used.

I would like to go back just a little bit to this map, if I may.

Mr. CANNON. Doctor, will you break down this estimate for us? How much of that \$6,300,000 will be spent for bait; how much for transportation; how much for personnel?

FUNCTIONS OF PERSONNEL ON GRASSHOPPER CONTROL

Let me ask you about your personnel. Is this work done by personnel who have other duties and functions in the Department, or do you have men who are assigned exclusively to this work?

Dr. ROHWER. May I first tell you, Congressman Cannon, that I do not have readily available a break-down of last year's expenditures.

Mr. CANNON. I am surprised that you would come to the committee without that information. It seems to me it would be the most natural thing in the world, if you were coming up here for this much money to be prepared to tell us how you expected to spend it.

Dr. ROHWER. I have a break-down of the \$3.5 million item.

Mr. CANNON. Do you have people in your Bureau who are assigned exclusively to this work, or is this just incidental and is it handled in connection with other duties in the Department?

Dr. ROHWER. For the over-all technical work of grasshopper control, Congressman Cannon, we have a small force of 15 full-time employees with headquarters in our Denver office, who are carried 12 months of the year.

Mr. CANNON. When are these hoppers hatched?

Dr. ROHWER. They begin hatching, in the South, some time in the latter part of April and continue to the latter part of June, when you get them up into northern Montana.

Mr. CANNON. That is about 2½ months during which you combat this pest?

Dr. ROHWER. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. What do these men do the other 9½ months of the year?

Dr. ROHWER. They are actively engaged; at the end of this season, at the end of the actual control season—and the control season may begin the latter part of April and end the first part of October; that is, the actual bait distribution in the western part of the United States—

Mr. CANNON. What do these men do from October until April? That is a rather prolonged vacation.

Dr. ROHWER. After the control season we have the job of making the surveys which are the basis on which we forecast grasshopper abundance for the next season. The surveys take 2 months of the year. It takes more than this office help that I have indicated to do

that. The office help have to take care of the mapping, writing reports, taking care of the equipment, preparation of inventories of supplies. You know that we have inventories of supplies which we furnish to a county after the appropriate arrangement is made with the State. We have the responsibility of knowing how much is left and how well it is being stored and what condition it will be in for possible use the next season. So there is a lot of work tied to grasshopper control in addition to just getting out and fighting the grasshopper.

Mr. CANNON. There must be such a great deal of slack time, I do not see why this job could not be handled by people who have other duties as well. You have a great many peak loads in the Department, among various activities. I do not see why this work could not be handled by other people who have other duties to perform.

NATIONAL ASPECT OF GRASSHOPPER CONTROL

Doctor, why is this a national problem? Why should the national Government intervene in this problem? Down in the South we have the cotton weevil. Why should not the Government come down there and destroy the cotton weevil for us? Or why should not the Government go up to the Corn Belt where we have the corn borer, which is causing us a lot of trouble now? Then there are the orchard sections of the country. We have the coddling moth to contend with. All of those problems are more national problems than that of the grasshopper and affect vastly more important and more valuable crops.

All that the Government proposes to do here, as I see it, is to save some grassland, or some grazing land which is not worth a great deal per acre. It is certainly not a national problem.

Why is it not an Arizona problem or a Montana problem rather than a national problem? We have many cotton States, we have many corn States, we have many orchard States. Why is one a national problem any more than the other?

Dr. ROHWER. May I first say that grasshoppers are no respecters of crops? They attack cotton and the work that we are doing in west Texas is primarily for the protection of cotton. They destroy corn, wheat, flax, and all types of cereal crops in addition to the grasses upon which they feed.

Mr. CANNON. Yes; but not nearly on the scale of the coddling moth or the boll weevil or the corn borer. They destroy more than these grasshoppers destroy in the cottonfields and in the cornfields. What the grasshoppers destroy is infinitesimal compared with the damage done by the corn borer and the boll weevil. Why should we make fish of one and fowl of another?

Dr. ROHWER. There is a big difference between a grasshopper infestation in the western plains of Texas and the boll weevil, because in one case the farmers can go out and take care of the boll weevil. He cannot take care of the grasshopper. They are developed on the range, in idle land or ditch banks and then fly in and over night destroy the crops. That has happened with grasshoppers over and over again. Where grasshoppers are not occurring, then the farmers are taking care of them. That was the part that I was telling you about a minute ago.

PAST GRASSHOPPER CONTROL PROGRAMS AND THEIR COST

Mr. CANNON. The grasshopper program began on a national scale about 1935, so it has been running some 14 years. Are we any better off; have we saved the farmers of the country any more in the last 10 years than they lost in the preceding years?

Dr. ROHWER. Yes; for every 75 cents spent, we save about \$10,000 of crop destruction.

Mr. CANNON. How do you estimate that?

Dr. ROHWER. That is estimated not by us but by the cooperating State people. We know what our cost is that we put into a county for bait control.

Mr. CANNON. Have you ever made a comparable estimate in connection with the boll weevil?

Dr. ROHWER. No. I would like to interrupt myself a little bit here to say this. A small part of the money that is appropriated under the incipient and emergency item this year is to carry on surveys in the cotton South, to help the State people advise the farmers where and when infestations occur and importantly right now to help in the distribution of insecticides; \$50,000 of the \$1,495,000 that has been allocated is being used for that. That is a cooperative effort.

We are doing the same thing in relation to the corn borer. The European corn borer this year is more destructive and more widespread than it has ever been at any time in the United States.

Mr. CANNON. We are spending less money on it than we spent on it 10 years ago. Ten years ago we appropriated vast sums of money and then later decided that it was wasted and discontinued that. Is it not possible that we should make the same decision about the grasshopper?

Dr. ROHWER. There again, Congressman Cannon, if the farmer knows what to do and when to do it, he can protect his corn. By applying insecticides to his corn he can protect his corn from the corn borer. He needs advice on timing.

Mr. CANNON. But you are not at this time advocating the expenditure of sums comparable to those that we spent 10 years ago?

Dr. ROHWER. No, sir.

Mr. CANNON. Why could we not apply the same rule to the grasshopper?

Dr. ROHWER. Because the grasshopper develops on the range and on abandoned and idle land and ditch banks and moves from there to a place where he gets into crops and destroys the crops overnight before the farmer can do anything about it.

Mr. CANNON. Can you give us the amounts that have been spent for grasshopper control each year from 1935 down to 1949?

Dr. ROHWER. Very easily, sir.

Mr. CANNON. Let us have it now, year by year; tell us how much has been spent by the Federal Government each year and the total amount.

Dr. ROHWER. I think I can do it from 1937 on with the papers that I have before me. This starts with the fiscal year 1937-38. The allotments are—and these are substantially correct as to expenditures; the difference would only be a minor difference of a few thousand dollars—as follows: 1937-38, \$1,000,000; 1938-39, \$1,809,-

000; 1939-40, \$2,173,400. I might include one other figure in there. There is \$1,750,000 additional for that crop year, through a deficiency, so that figure becomes \$3,923,400.

In the next year the expenditures were \$1,784,000.

For 1941-42, \$996,500; for the fiscal year 1942-43 the expenditures were \$662,500; for 1943-44, \$1,573,000; for the fiscal year 1945-46, \$1,040,500; for 1947, \$1,889,000.

We have been talking about 1948. The figures for 1948 that I have in this tabulation are \$860,000. The total for the period from 1937 to 1948 is \$18,322,560. This does not go back to the years earlier than the present authorizing language.

Mr. CANNON. Do your figures indicate that these grasshoppers appear in cycles?

Dr. ROHWER. Yes, sir. And you will notice that the appropriations likewise varied in amounts from year to year.

Mr. CANNON. But the amount asked for this year is as large as you have ever asked for?

Dr. ROHWER. No; we have had a larger amount for grasshoppers. It was over \$4,000,000 for grasshoppers alone. The appropriation we are talking about includes other items than grasshoppers, as you know.

Mr. CANNON. The Mormon crickets?

Dr. ROHWER. The Mormon crickets are involved in here; chinch bugs; the white-fringed beetle; Hall scale, and various surveys that we have been carrying on, including the one we initiated last spring, where we had a small allotment on the fire ant in the Southern States. All that is carried out under the same allotment.

Mr. CANNON. In what years have you expended more than 6.3 million dollars?

Dr. ROHWER. Year 1939 was probably the highest when we had an appropriation of \$5,400,000.

Mr. CANNON. In other words, you are asking more this year than you have ever asked before?

Dr. ROHWER. No.

Mr. CANNON. After 10 years of campaigning and fighting you are in worse condition now than you have ever been before?

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Cannon, I believe it should be made clear that the figure \$6,300,000 includes money that was available for these other programs that are paid for out of this appropriations and they would total, as I have figured it roughly here, from \$1,300,000 to \$1,500,000; that is true, is it not, Dr. Rohwer?

Dr. ROHWER. That is right.

Mr. ROBERTS. So that for grasshoppers the figure that has been used of 6.3 million dollars should be more nearly 5 million or 4.8 million dollars.

Mr. CANNON. But it is the largest amount that you have ever asked for this purpose.

Mr. ROBERTS. With the exception of 1 year since 1937.

Mr. CANNON. So you are not making any progress at all; you are in worse condition than you have ever been before.

Dr. ROHWER. No.

Mr. CANNON. Judging by the amount of money you are asking?

Dr. ROHWER. No; I do not think we are in worse position than we have ever been before.

Mr. CANNON. Then why do you ask for more money than you have ever asked before?

Dr. ROHWER. We are asking a larger part of this appropriation for knocking down the infestation. This red area on the map, which I had not discussed, is the area where grasshoppers in the past have always originated. If the grasshoppers overflow from this area eastward, northward, southeastward, we will have a lot of grasshoppers clear down as far as Texas and in the area next to your area.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Cannon, if you will permit me to interrupt for a question, I notice you say that they always originate there; but my recollection is that earlier you said that you never had treated this area; I wondered why.

Dr. ROHWER. That is right. We have never had the means, Congressman Whitten, before, to undertake to treat grasshoppers in that area. We are this year distributing bait over a larger area, with the use of aircraft, than we have ever tried before. Up to last night we had distributed bait by aircraft and ground machines in this red-marked area—in these two States—I say “we” our collaborators who have done it independently, and with our help, who have paid part of the cost of the machine—we have treated 2,700,000 acres of grassland and croplands. And there is about that amount left, to knock the heart out of that infestation.

If this is successful, we should eliminate that widespread infestation that was the forerunner of these infestations that led to these large expenditures in 1937-39. I think if we would go back to the record, it was 1934-35 when we spent about \$5,000,000 in one season for grasshopper control. But it was not spent in this area at all.

The work that we are doing up here is to try to stop the recurrence of those things that happened before. We have, I believe, the devices, machinery and new kinds of tools and the poisons to do that work this year.

Mr. CANNON. You have told us all along that there was no hope whatever of extermination of the grasshopper. Do you mean to tell us now that if you get into these areas heretofore untreated, where they originate, where they are spawned, that we might eventually eradicate them?

Dr. ROHWER. Well, Congressman Cannon, you could eradicate them, but to eradicate grasshoppers, which means getting the last insect, is not economically feasible. It is economically feasible to keep the populations down so they do not migrate, so they do not occur in numbers sufficient to destroy crops.

DISCUSSION OF NEED FOR FUNDS REQUESTED

Mr. CANNON. You are asking for \$3,500,000. That is a tremendous amount of money for this program this late in the season. It is unprecedented in the history of control of the grasshopper. If you were allowed \$2,000,000 instead of \$3,500,000, what difference would it make in your program and what difference would it make in the results which you expect to obtain?

Dr. ROHWER. It is pretty hard to answer that categorically. This estimate of 3.5 million dollars that we are now making contemplate taking care of the situation through the remainder of the fiscal year.

Mr. CANNON. If we should allow you \$1,500,000 or \$2,000,000—
Dr. ROHWER. We could not do it.

Mr. CANNON. You could go ahead with your program on a very large scale. Perhaps you could not do everything that you expected to do, but as far as practical results are concerned, you would not save much more in national farm products if you had 3.5 million dollars?

Dr. ROHWER. The program that we have here, as I have indicated, carries under this item of appropriation, the white-fringed beetle, Hall scale, which is an eradication project carried on in California against the introduction of a pest that has two foci of infestation, Chico, Calif., and Davis, Calif.

Mr. CANNON. All of these are important pests in their immediate locality, but nationally they are insignificant. They are not in the same class at all with the boll weevil or the codling moth or the corn borer. I cannot understand why there should be such a differentiation between them.

Dr. ROHWER. The Hall scale is not an important pest. We are trying to eradicate it so it will not spread and be an important pest. The white-fringed beetle is an important pest in parts of the south, where it occurs. We are doing our best to prevent its spread into new areas. The expenditures on a 12-month basis for that program approximate \$860,000. That is an amount that would come out of this 3.5 million dollars if the amount is provided.

Mr. CANNON. Are you at the peak of your program at this time? Are you spending more money per day at this time than at any time in the fiscal year?

Dr. ROHWER. On grasshoppers; yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. How much are you spending per day?

Dr. ROHWER. We are spending in the neighborhood of \$200,000 a day, the days we buy bait.

Mr. CANNON. How many days in the month do you buy bait?

Dr. ROHWER. Not very many.

Mr. TABER. Three or four?

Dr. ROHWER. Three or four. We have contractual obligations for flying at this time which come to \$30,000 per day.

Mr. CANNON. That is every day?

Dr. ROHWER. Six days a week. We do not fly on Sunday.

Mr. CANNON. Even at that rate, \$2,000,000 would carry you well past the grasshopper season, would it not?

Dr. ROHWER. Yes; it would carry us past this season.

Mr. CANNON. Then why do you ask for this additional money?

Dr. ROHWER. It would then be necessary to come up and talk about grasshoppers for the spring of next year; and also for carrying out the plan that has been followed for the last few years on this program of deficiency appropriations after the Congress convenes.

Mr. CANNON. You are not really talking about a deficiency appropriation, Doctor. If, as you testify, 1.5 million or 2 million dollars would carry you well through the grasshopper extermination season, why do you not wait and then come before the regular subcommittee on agricultural appropriations for the remainder of 2 million or 2.5 million dollars.

Dr. ROHWER. Mr. Cannon, you will recall that as far as incipient and emergency appropriations are concerned, for a while we were

getting money on a 12 months' basis. With the fiscal year 1949 Congress indicated that they reduced the appropriation so as to provide enough money until they could consider a deficiency at the beginning of the next year. In this estimate of 3.5 million dollars—

Mr. CANNON. If you asked for \$1,500,000 or \$2,000,000 here, you would be taking care of a deficiency according to your terms; but when you ask for 3.5 million dollars here you are going entirely beyond, away beyond a deficiency appropriation. It seems to me that you should take that up with the regular committee which handles the annual bill.

Dr. ROHWER. This is an additional amount for the fiscal year 1950, Mr. Cannon.

Mr. CANNON. That is all, Mr. Chairman, thank you.

APPROPRIATED FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR FISCAL YEARS 1949 AND 1950

Mr. KERR. Let me ask one question to clear up something in my own mind. In 1949 you had \$3,000,000?

Dr. ROHWER. That is right.

Mr. KERR. For the fiscal year you had \$1,750,000 and then there was a deficiency which we gave you of \$1,250,000?

Dr. ROHWER. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. That was \$3,000,000 for this work?

Dr. ROHWER. Yes.

Mr. KERR. For all the work embraced in this statement which you have submitted?

Dr. ROHWER. Yes.

Mr. KERR. Now you come back for 1950, and we have given you \$1,245,000 which is available for the fiscal year 1950.

Dr. ROHWER. I think, Mr. Chairman, the amount available for the fiscal year 1950, beginning July 1, is \$1,495,000.

Mr. KERR. That is more than I thought it was, and more than the record disclosed.

Mr. RABAUT. How does that happen? Was there a carry-over of \$250,000?

Dr. ROHWER. No.

Mr. KERR. It excludes \$250,000 for forest pest control.

Dr. ROHWER. That is right.

Mr. KERR. In this present request you are asking \$3,500,000, which makes \$4,995,000, excluding the \$250,000 which is transferred?

Mr. RABAUT. \$2,000,000 more than last year.

Mr. KERR. You are now getting about \$5,000,000?

Dr. ROHWER. \$5,000,000 for the item incipient and emergency—

Mr. KERR. You never received that much before.

Dr. ROHWER. Yes. I am sorry, but we have, sir.

Mr. KERR. Have you? You did not read it out awhile ago.

Dr. ROHWER. I read you the appropriations that were basically fiscal-year appropriations. When we had deficiencies we had one year which was more than \$5,000,000.

Mr. KERR. How far back was that?

Dr. ROHWER. 1939.

Mr. KERR. Ten years. This is the only one that comes up about near matching that one?

Dr. ROHWER. That is correct.

EXTENT OF EXTERMINATION OF GRASSHOPPERS

Mr. KERR. It does not appear that you are exterminating these insects to any large degree. In fact, it appears that you have not done so.

What do you think about that? Are the insects going to conquer us in this world?

Dr. ROHWER. Not by a long way. We are getting ahead of the insects now.

Mr. KERR. Out there in the vast area in the Northwest, for the amount of money you are getting, it looks like you are not doing too well. The States have put up about \$1,000,000, also, I believe, in those 2 years.

Dr. ROHWER. Yes.

Mr. KERR. So really, when you add that to the \$5,000,000, you have about \$6,000,000. That is the biggest amount you have ever had, except 10 years ago, and you have not gotten very far.

Dr. ROHWER. If we talk about the \$5,000,000 contemplated for fiscal year 1950, a little more than \$1,200,000 of that goes to items other than grasshoppers.

Now, of the amount that goes to grasshoppers, that will be matched or more than matched by State, private, and local individuals, so the grasshopper job for the fiscal year 1950 is pretty near \$8,000,000.

Mr. KERR. An \$8,000,000 job?

Dr. ROHWER. Yes. It has always been on a matching basis.

Mr. KERR. The cost for this treatment to exterminate them has been increasing as the years go by.

Dr. ROHWER. It has not been increasing. It has been decreasing.

Mr. KERR. What is the increased cost? Is that the larger extent of the area?

Dr. ROHWER. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. By George, you have not been able to do much about destroying them, then.

Dr. ROHWER. We have controlled grasshoppers over large areas for a long period of time, but grasshoppers are not appearing in the same spots every year.

If we would look at the map of last year, we had no infestations of grasshoppers in Arizona, with the exception of a small cropland area southwest of the Salt River Valley in Arizona. That infestation is not even causing us any alarm or concern this year. It is the build-up of the infestation down here in this area [indicating] that is doing it.

PLANNED USE OF FUNDS REQUESTED

Mr. KERR. What are you going to do with this \$3,500,000 which you are asking for now? What do you propose to do with it?

Dr. ROHWER. We propose to use this money for the remainder of the fiscal year to conduct the grasshopper program that we are carrying on in cooperation with the States for the remainder of this season at the present aggressive program.

The program that we will carry on next spring with grasshoppers will depend on what grasshopper situations are next spring.

We will continue to use approximately \$865,000 for work on white-fringe beetle control in the Gulf Coast States.

We will use \$135,000 for the effort to eradicate the Hall scale and prevent its being spread and becoming established in new areas in the United States.

About \$60,000 will be used to cooperate with the States in these appraisal surveys and advisory surveys on how and where and when to control the European corn borer. That will be matched on the basis of 2 to 1 by the States.

Mr. KERR. The States will put up \$2 for every \$1 by the Government?

Dr. ROHWER. That is right.

And we will carry on these surveys that we have been doing in cooperation with the States in the South to appraise cotton insects and help distribute the poisons for cotton insect control which are short. The amount of money we will allocate to that will be about \$75,000, and there again, the States and private agencies put in \$2 to our \$1.

We will spend a small amount of, I think, about \$10,000 for work in cooperation with the States, on fire ants. That will be the States of Florida, Mississippi, and Alabama.

Mr. KERR. Fire ants?

Dr. ROHWER. Yes, sir. There is a little ant down there in those areas that is about the size of a pavement ant. It lives in very large colonies and builds mounds of about 18 inches high and 24 inches apart, and has a very vicious sting. When it gets into the area where crops are produced, or on the edges of the things, you cannot get people to harvest your crops.

We are trying to help them locate those spots and advise them on how to kill ants.

Mr. KERR. Could you not pour kerosene oil in each one of the mounds?

Dr. ROHWER. It will not kill them, because these ants, Congressman, have a habit of making a lot of galleries and a lot of little chambers underneath their mounds, in which they hide. However, we find that if we knock off the top of the mound a little and puff in a new poison, chlordane, we get very effective control.

Mr. KERR. You have never tried kerosene oil?

Dr. ROHWER. I do not think they have on that. That might work.

Then there is about \$20,000 that will be used in cooperation with the State animal husbandry, extension service and research people in reference to screwworms. Screwworms, because of the mild winter they had in the South and Southeast, are spreading northward, and we have found them now at this time of the year, which is a little earlier than usual, in the northern part of Georgia. The object of that work is to help locate these infestations and to have the county agents and the cattlemen immediately apply a remedy to control screwworms.

You will recall, Congressman Cannon, I think it was in 1934 or thereabouts when the screw worm invaded the Southeast. We had a cooperative aggressive program to educate the people in the South and help them in learning how to combat the screw worm.

I think I have now told you about all the allotments that will be made out of this \$3,500,000.

Mr. KERR. Give us a little break-down.

BREAK-DOWN OF EXPENDITURES UNDER REQUEST

Dr. ROHWER. Of the expenditures under the ordinary basis of classification?

For personal services, this includes temporary help, and most of it is temporary help, the total is \$620,000.

There is a great deal of travel involved in connection with this work, and that we estimate at \$150,000.

For the transportation of bait and bait materials and insecticides there is \$200,000.

Communications services is \$9,000.

Rent and utility services, including offices for the permanent establishments and garage, rental, and other things, is \$22,000.

Contractual services, which in this case involve primarily planes, is \$825,000.

Supplies and material, which involve basically bran and insecticides for baits for grasshopper control, is \$1,660,000.

Then there is a small item for equipment of \$14,000.

That totals \$3,500,000.

I am sorry. I do not have copies of this paper available, Congressman Taber, but here is one for you. There is one here I would be glad to make available to the chairman.

RATE OF EXPENDITURES AND OBLIGATIONS

Mr. TABER. You said you had \$1,200,000, other than grasshoppers, and that would leave you \$5,100,000. You have already covered half of that.

Dr. ROHWER. Are you talking about including last year's money, Congressman Taber?

Mr. TABER. Including what there was available when the first deficiency bill, which did not become law until just about the first of the year, went through.

Dr. ROHWER. The 24th of May. Then my \$1,000,000 figure I gave you would have to be increased by a little bit more there because that takes care of the hall seal and—

Mr. TABER. How much would that be?

Dr. ROHWER. On a month-and-a-half basis?

Mr. TABER. That would run it up to \$100,000?

Dr. ROHWER. Yes, sir; more than that, Congressman. About \$150,000 in round figures.

Mr. TABER. That would be \$1,350,000 out of this \$6,300,000. That would leave \$4,950,000.

Now, at this point you have already expended or laid out to expend a balance of about \$1,700,000 or about \$1,650,000 on the grasshopper business, is that right?

Dr. ROHWER. No. For grasshoppers we have obligated, as of July 22, \$1,311,630. For the other activities, white-fringe beetle, Hall seal, these surveys that I have told you about, we have obligated to July 22, \$1,116,130.

I am sorry. I did not give you the figures quite right, Congressman. It was \$1,195,500 and \$116,130, making total obligations as of July 22 of \$1,311,630.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. For grasshoppers?

Dr. ROHWER. Grasshoppers and all the other activities.

Mr. TABER. \$1,311,630?

Dr. ROHWER. Out of this fiscal year, only.

Mr. TABER. How about the other money that was left over?

Dr. ROHWER. That is not available to us, and there was a very small amount left over. I think the money that we had for the fiscal year 1949, nonexpended balance, was around \$4,000.

Mr. TABER. You say you spent \$1,116,000 for grasshoppers?

Dr. ROHWER. No. For grasshoppers out of this fiscal-year money we spent \$1,195,500, or obligated it.

We have spent for the other activities \$116,130, making total obligations as of Friday, July 22, \$1,311,630, against a \$1,500,000 appropriation.

EXTENT OF COVERAGE OF CONTROL

Mr. TABER. As I understood it, you told us you were covering about 2½ million acres thoroughly with these funds that were already available, and that the grasshoppers would be practically knocked out in that territory, is that not right?

Dr. ROHWER. In the 2,750,000 acres that we have baited, the grasshoppers are practically knocked down. We are getting 95 percent control, so that means 95 grasshoppers out of every 100 are dead.

Mr. TABER. You have just about as much territory to cover as you have already covered?

Dr. ROHWER. Yes, and this is in the red spot on that map.

Mr. TABER. Then why would not \$1,200,000 cover it? If you have done half of it with \$1,195,500, why would not \$1,200,000 cover the job? That is the difficult part of it to follow.

Dr. ROHWER. We have been directing our discussion, Congressman Taber, basically to this area where we are baiting with aircraft.

USE AND COST OF BAIT

Now, the farmer in western Kansas, western Nebraska, and eastern Colorado can control grasshoppers in the fall of the year. They bait just before the second generation of grasshoppers lays its eggs. All that baiting should be done to kill grasshoppers, to prevent crop destruction and build up for the next year.

In that area it is not practical for the farmers to control grasshoppers in the first generation because that is the time they have to cut their grain. That is when the wheat has to be harvested, so they do their grasshopper control in the fall.

That is not included in these figures we have been talking about, nor do they include the job in southeastern Arizona, where we should expend, in cooperation with the State, \$200,000, of which the State will pay one-half.

Mr. TABER. That would be \$100,000. How much would the Nebraska-Kansas set-up be?

Dr. ROHWER. In this area we furnish the bait and they do the work. It is on a 50-50 basis.

Mr. TABER. How much will it run?

Dr. ROHWER. The amount of the bait we will probably have to use in that area, or which will be used in that area, will be about 3,000 tons. That will average between \$55 and \$60 a ton.

Mr. TABER. Two hundred tons at \$55 or \$60 a ton?

Dr. ROHWER. That is right. About \$200,000 for bait will go into that area in the fall.

Mr. TABER. \$200,000. Then, in the Nebraska-Kansas, what else have you in the program that you are going to do?

Dr. ROHWER. In this area which is more or less northeast of Los Angeles, Calif., in the cropland and range land there, and in the area southeast of San Diego, Calif., there will be fall baiting.

Mr. TABER. How much will that be?

Dr. ROHWER. The baiting that will go into that area will probably be in the neighborhood of 2,500 tons, Congressman Taber.

Mr. TABER. At \$50 a ton?

Dr. ROHWER. Yes, the same figure.

Mr. TABER. That would be about \$75,000?

Dr. ROHWER. In round numbers.

There will be continued baiting up in the croplands of Montana north of the heavily infested area; and in the northwestern section of Montana, in the northwest corner of North Dakota, and then the baiting in Minnesota and Wisconsin, and the baiting in Wisconsin is just starting.

I do not have very firm figures on the amount of bait to be used, because it is not practicable to use these poisons by sprays or dust because of the hazard to dairy cattle in that area, and we have to use bait.

Mr. TABER. What do you think that would run? Is that about 1,000 tons or 1,500?

Dr. ROHWER. No. For all these areas I have mentioned they will go up to about 4,000 tons.

Mr. TABER. Four thousand tons?

Dr. ROHWER. I have not included each spot.

Mr. TABER. That would be \$200,000.

Dr. ROHWER. Two hundred forty thousand dollars; \$60 per ton.

Mr. TABER. I thought it was \$50.

Dr. ROHWER. I gave you the price of \$60 per ton. That is the average price of bran. I have left out the insecticides. They are about 75 cents more a ton.

Mr. TABER. That is all there is of it?

Dr. ROHWER. I think we have largely covered the areas.

Mr. TABER. Then that would make \$715,000 plus \$1,195,000. That gives you about \$1,900,000.

COST OF WHITE FRINGE BEETLE AND HALL SCALE

Dr. ROHWER. We must carry on the white fringe beetle work, Congressman Taber, which cost \$860,000.

Mr. TABER. You did not spend that last year?

Dr. ROHWER. Yes. We spent \$861,000.

Mr. TABER. How much did you spend?

Dr. ROHWER. For the fiscal year 1949 we spent on white fringe beetle \$861,000, and for hall scale \$135,000. We estimate for hall scale this year \$135,000 and for white fringe beetle \$865,000.

Mr. TABER. That would make \$2,800,000 or \$2,900,000.

You had in 1949 altogether to use \$3,000,000.

USE OF FUNDS AVAILABLE BY FIRST DEFICIENCY BILL

On the \$1,750,000, you only got that the 24th of May, so you could not have spent a lot of that. Maybe you did.

Dr. ROHWER. The money became available the 24th of May, and we bought a great deal of bait and bran materials for the grasshopper-control program because grasshoppers were then reoccurring in numbers and we were continuing right on through.

In your figuring there, Congressman Taber, you have talked, and all the figures I have given you have related, only to the actual control costs to the end of the treating season for this year.

We need to know and we need to carry on surveys to appraise the situation for grasshoppers and our survey costs in round numbers are somewhat more than \$175,000.

Mr. TABER. You had \$1,250,000 from the 1st of July to the 24th of May and from the 24th of May to the 30th of June, just 5 or 5½ weeks later, you spent \$1,750,000, all but \$4,000 of which you had left over, unexpended. That sounds funny to me. I just do not see how you could do that.

Dr. ROHWER. A large part of that cost, Congressman Taber, went into the bait materials that we were using the first 2 weeks in July of this fiscal year.

It takes us from 10 days to 3 weeks to get the bait materials laid down to the places where we want them, so if we have an interruption today and if we stop buying bran for bait materials now, there will be a vacation, shall we say, at the point of use, of about 10 days to 2 weeks before we can control grasshoppers.

In the meantime, the grasshoppers are growing and are getting harder to kill and may have begun to move and fly into new areas.

Mr. TABER. I think that is all I have.

BAIT MATERIALS

Mr. CANNON. Incidentally, are you still using bran as a carrier?

Dr. ROHWER. The bait, Congressman Cannon, that we use with chlordane and toxaphene—these two new poisons—is a large flake bran. We impregnate these poisons on the large flake in a mixer, by blowing in a mist containing the poisons. They are in solution when added to the bran. When we use sodium fluosilicate, we use the mill-run bran and sawdust. Both cost about the same.

Mr. CANNON. The testimony some time ago was that sawdust would be substituted.

Dr. ROHWER. Yes; we do that.

Mr. CANNON. At a lower cost and at a saving of good feed.

Dr. ROHWER. We do that.

Mr. CANNON. The sawdust is a byproduct of the mills out there and is otherwise wasted, and can be bought more cheaply.

Dr. ROHWER. Yes; but the actual cost of the chlordane and toxaphene bait and the sodium fluosilicate mill run bran and sawdust is substantially the same per acre.

Mr. CANNON. You mean to say that you cannot buy sawdust cheaper than bran?

Dr. ROHWER. No. When we put the sawdust bait out, instead of using 5 pounds per acre we have to increase it to about 20 pounds per acre. There is a difference in the rate of application.

Mr. CANNON. They carry the same poison?

Dr. ROHWER. It carries a different poison. It is sodium fluosilicate. Sodium fluosilicate is a powder, and it is mixed and impregnated on the bran and sawdust by turning it over in a mixing mill and then dampening it.

When we use the other bait, we have a shaker or mill that keeps this mill run bran fluffy, and we blow in on that the liquid poison which adheres to the large flakes of bran.

The actual cost per acre of application of the two of them is about the same.

Mr. CANNON. How does the cost per unit of the poison and the carrier compare now with previous years?

COST PER UNIT OF POISONS AND CARRIERS

Dr. ROHWER. Well, it is a little bit higher because there has been an increased cost in bran, as you know, and there is an increased cost in sodium fluosilicate, and the newer poisons are slightly higher per pound than sodium fluosilicate. However, we use 1 pound in one case and 4 in another, so they are substantially the same in the cost of poisons.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Could you not do that job more cheaply if you did not do it all by plane?

USE OF AIRCRAFT

Dr. ROHWER. Where we can we use ground equipment, and many of the farmers use ground equipment, also, Congressman Wiggleworth.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. But you have an item of \$825,000 for plane transportation.

Dr. ROHWER. We just cannot cover the Wyoming-Montana area except by plane. Those are wide open spaces.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You used to cover them.

Dr. ROHWER. In this area that I read, this range-land area, we have never tried that before. On the 100,000 acres in the southwestern part of Arizona, it would be ground equipment, and the nature of the terrain directs ground equipment. You cannot use planes there.

That 100,000 acres would be basically handled by these bait-spreading machines which are dragged around at the end of a truck.

EFFECT OF POISON ON BIRDS

Mr. RABAUT. What is the effect of this poison upon birds?

Dr. ROHWER. As applied as baits, we have had no deleterious effects of any nature at all. As applied as sprays and dust, at the rate that it is used for grasshoppers, there is no effect. We have worked in close cooperation with the Fish and Wildlife Service, and they agree that there is no serious effect on any forms of wildlife. When we put out dusts or sprays in cropland areas where there may be alfalfa or other forage crops that are for dairy cattle or animals being fattened for slaughter, there is a hazard of a residue, and there we use bait to eliminate that hazard. The hazard does not occur with bait.

Mr. RABAUT. Was there not some spraying going on somewhere in the West the other day where it got into the intake of the air-conditioning system of a school and into a lot of children?

Dr. ROHWER. I had not heard of that.

Mr. RABAUT. It was in the paper.

Dr. ROHWER. I did not hear about it.

Mr. RABAUT. I think it was in connection with the grasshopper program or something. I think I read it either yesterday or the day before.

Dr. ROHWER. I have not heard of it, but I usually hear of those things. We have had some accidents in the use of insecticides this year.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Whitten.

Mr. WHITTEN. Where did the demand for activity in this area start; did the folks out there call on you for help?

Dr. ROHWER. In the grasshopper-control program?

Mr. WHITTEN. I mean this particular locality; where did the demand arise, in the field from the folks, or the State people out there?

Dr. ROHWER. Yes.

MATCHING OF FUNDS

Mr. WHITTEN. Under the law, you stated that there is local cooperation for the first time, and I believe you say that two States have matched funds; that their legislatures made funds available. Have you done that heretofore for them?

Dr. ROHWER. In those two States for grasshopper control, no.

Mr. WHITTEN. Since they all have not been contributing anything, do you not think it is entirely likely or just a little bit probable that since it did not cost them anything they would ask you to send this money out there, just to prevent the possibility of such an occurrence?

Dr. ROHWER. These farmers who have already lost range land are more anxious to protect other range land.

Mr. WHITTEN. But other States have come in here for the first time. You have been able to get them to put up some money now, as they see \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000 of Federal money coming out there and they have appropriated about \$200,000 for the first time.

Dr. ROHWER. When the range-land farmer pays 24 cents an acre to have bait distributed on that acre, he is pretty sure that it is paying dividends to him.

Mr. WHITTEN. Do you not think it would be proper to have conditions attached to these appropriations requiring local contributions, so that there would be some tendency at the local level not to spend these funds unless it is essential to do so?

Dr. ROHWER. In this whole program it requires cooperation, and in the grasshopper-control program the cooperation is on a 50-50 basis.

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, cooperation may mean letting you have an office, or it may mean that he comes to see you once in a while. It is a very broad or narrow term, depending on the amount and the kind of cooperation given.

Dr. ROHWER. The State and local agencies pay 50 percent of the cost of grasshopper control. In the State of Montana this year they are paying 63 percent.

COST OF AIRPLANE USE

Mr. WHITTEN. You say that you are spending \$30,000 a day for airplanes. Whose airplanes are those, and how are your contracts let?

Dr. ROHWER. Under competitive bids.

Mr. WHITTEN. Have you made any investigation to see whether or not the Army could supply that part of it? In the Army they require so many flying hours' time in order to keep their rating. Do you not think the Army would be glad to do that for you?

Dr. ROHWER. We would like very much to get all the benefit we can of Army flyers.

Mr. WHITTEN. Did you make a formal request of them?

Dr. ROHWER. They have to have hoppers on the planes. Each plane that is used to distribute bait has to have a hopper in which the bait will be used.

Mr. WHITTEN. Do you not think it would be cheaper to buy a few hoppers and give them to the Army than to spend \$30,000 a day for airplanes, because the Army has no hoppers?

Dr. ROHWER. You cannot install them readily in the Army planes. You would have to tear the plane to pieces to install them; and, even if you could do so, you would have venturae coming out of the plane, and that takes time to install them.

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, you have had plenty of it. You have been engaged in this program since 1935; and, if it takes time, you have had some time. Have you not?

Dr. ROHWER. But we have not had the Army willing to do it.

USE OF FOREST SERVICE PLANES

Mr. WHITTEN. How about the Forest Service? I know they have a lot of planes, and this is right in the area of the forests, and I am am sure that there is complete coordination within the Department to the point where one bureau would be glad to keep down the expenses over all. Would they not?

Dr. ROHWER. We have three planes and are using those. We are taking planes from the gypsy-moth area and using those.

Mr. WHITTEN. You have not been into the Forest Service yet?

Dr. ROHWER. The Forest Serviee planes are not of the type we can use.

Mr. WHITTEN. Can you not get a little coordination in the type of planes that the Forest Service uses and the Department of Agriculture buys, so that you could eoordinate these activities?

Dr. ROHWER. The planes have to be bought for the type or purpose you want to use them, and all planes to distribute pesticides are not very suitable for many other uses. We want a slow-speed and high-lifting-power plane.

Mr. WHITTEN. Do you not think that fits right into the Forest Service demands?

Dr. ROHWER. It fits into some of the Forest Service planes, but they have not been modified, and it would take that modification.

Mr. WHITTEN. Nor have they been requested to turn their planes over to you to do this work for you; have they?

Dr. ROHWER. The time they need them for fire observations is just the time when we need them for grasshopper control.

Mr. WHITTEN. In reference to this immediate area, I understood you to say earlier that you had never been in this area, but that you have always been working in the worst areas, and later you said you were working here because this was the breeding ground or the starting point of these grasshopper pests. Now, which one of those is correct?

Dr. ROHWER. We have never tried to control these infestations—

Mr. WHITTEN. In 12 years you have never tried to reach the source of infestation which is this area in Montana?

Dr. ROHWER. Let me try to make that point a little clearer, Mr. Whitten. The infestations 50 years back came from that area, but we finally have after all located that area—

Mr. WHITTEN. You knew that at the time; did you not?

Dr. ROHWER. Not as well as we know it now; no.

DISCUSSION RESULTS OBTAINED FROM EXPENDITURES FOR CONTROL

Mr. WHITTEN. Have you ever requested Congress to appropriate funds to let you go in there to the seat of the trouble and fight it?

Dr. ROHWER. This is the first time we have done so, Congressman Whitten.

Mr. WHITTEN. This is an emergency program, and you have 15 people on permanent jobs. If it ever gets to the point where you do not have some of this work to do, you would have to let those 15 people go; would you not?

Dr. ROHWER. Sure.

Mr. WHITTEN. So, it is to somebody's interest, at least, to find some of this type of trouble each and every year; is it not?

Dr. ROHWER. Well, Mr. Whitten—

Mr. WHITTEN. The history of it is that, when one of these programs is once started, it never stops, and the history of the appropriations shows that you are hardly ever able to cut them down.

The thing that disturbs me is—and we have raised it in the committee and in the hearings—that it is a serious question as to whether under our system and our methods we get a full dollar's worth of value for each dollar spent; and, while we get local cooperation, certainly, there is a question in my mind as to whether we are not spending an awful lot of money for the results we get.

You folks can make out a case in almost any field. The income of the Federal Government is about \$40,000,000,000, and we could spend every dollar of the \$40,000,000,000 if we set out to control all the insects that affect one crop or another in this country; but, of course, that would be foolish.

Dr. ROHWER. I agree with you.

Mr. WHITTEN. And you could do it easily if you set out to try to find them. I am not talking about surveys, research, and methods of improvement. I am talking of control programs that are very, very expensive. These control programs should be held to those places where there is no question about the results being efficient, because they are very expensive.

Now, I wonder if it would not be advisable to make a close study of these various control programs. I was raised on a farm, and every year in the middle of the summer, when we were through with the crops and it was not yet time to start harvesting, if we could have gotten the Federal Government to come in there and give us some

between-season employment, it would have been well and good. I do not mean to say that there is no grasshopper problem; but, if you leave it where all you have to do is get local demand to spend Federal money, you can always get the local demand to do that.

Dr. ROHWER. If it were just demand without their matching the funds, it would be one thing, but when they match it in cost, why, I do not think they are going to do it unless they need it.

Mr. WHITTEN. Who hires these local people that help you?

Dr. ROHWER. When it is in cropland areas, Congressman Whitten, the State hires the people.

Mr. WHITTEN. The folks who are in control. That is pretty good politics to be able to hire a lot of folks for these programs.

Dr. ROHWER. There is very little other than temporary hiring done locally.

Mr. WHITTEN. I have reference to the barberry-control program. If a governor or a supervisor or what have you, if he could hire three or four thousand people during the summer hunting barberry, it is not bad business, politically speaking. It is awfully bad business if we are not getting sufficient results for the money that we are spending. I personally feel that it is a field for us to look into. I do not mean that there is not need for doing some work, but I think it is the right field to look into to see whether our dollars are getting the results you and I and the people would like to have them get.

Dr. ROHWER. When we talked about Federal programs, I think your committee asked us to review all of our programs critically, from the standpoint of State cooperation and legislation, and we are doing that.

Mr. WHITTEN. You recall you came before us for appropriations on these measures, and stated that you did not know what the State laws were or what they required, and in most States they were not enforcing the law. Notwithstanding that, we still voted to put the Federal Government's money out there to cure the problem, not even knowing if they had State laws, and, if so, whether they were carrying them out, and in many cases they were not carrying them out.

Dr. ROHWER. I am afraid we were not as good witnesses on that question as the facts are.

Mr. WHITTEN. A witness gets along in accordance with the facts presented by him, and I am afraid I will have to agree that you were not up on the background as much as you could have been. That is all.

COMPARISON OF ESTIMATED REQUIREMENTS FOR 1950 WITH EXPENDITURES FOR PRIOR YEAR

Mr. KERR. You have available \$1,495,000 and you are asking for \$3,500,000. You said you have estimated for 1950 \$4,995,000. How does that compare with the estimates of past years, for instance, for the fiscal 1948. You are asking for nearly \$5,000,000 for 1950. How does that compare with the amount of money spent, for instance, in 1949?

Dr. ROHWER. In the year 1949 we spent \$3,000,000 in round numbers.

Mr. KERR. \$3,000,000; and then, notwithstanding what we have done with these insects, things are getting worse all the time.

Dr. ROHWER. In grasshoppers for the 1948 fiscal year, we spent \$1,076,319, and \$1,800,000 in 1949.

Mr. KERR. Now you received \$1,250,000 for 1949 in the deficiency appropriation.

Dr. ROHWER. That is correct. In giving the figures for grasshoppers for 1950, the expenditures will be about \$3,700,000 for grasshoppers.

Mr. KERR. That is the largest amount you have ever asked for for grasshopper control?

Dr. ROHWER. No; it is not the largest.

Mr. KERR. There is one other item you have asked for that was larger—

Dr. ROHWER. For 1939; and I will be glad to go back to the year 1937 and indicate the amounts spent in the period from 1932 to 1937.

Mr. KERR. We just want to compare the amounts spent in the various years.

AREA OF INFESTATION TO BE TREATED AND ESTIMATED COSTS

Mr. TABER. Yes. Now, you came in here way back on the 27th of January asking for a deficiency appropriation, and you said that \$1,050,000 was tied in to grasshoppers. You were aware then that there was this infestation over this acreage; were you not?

Dr. ROHWER. Yes, sir, and at that time, Congressman Taber, I told you that I thought we would need to treat 1,500,000 acres in that area and I started my testimony out this afternoon to tell you that we were not right. Grasshoppers came out in a larger area.

Mr. TABER. You have treated so far about 2,500,000?

Dr. ROHWER. We should be treating 5,000,000 acres.

Mr. TABER. You want to treat another 2,000,000?

Dr. ROHWER. We should be treating 5,000,000 acres.

Mr. TABER. Now, your job there on the 2,500,000 acres was done with approximately \$2,500,000; is that right? You told us that the amount of the 1949 appropriation for grasshoppers, or the allotment, would be \$1,050,000?

Dr. ROHWER. That was out of the estimate we were asking for the remainder of the then current fiscal year.

Mr. TABER. You had \$1,050,000 for that?

Dr. ROHWER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TABER. Out of how much requested?

Dr. ROHWER. \$1,350,000 requested.

Mr. TABER. \$1,350,000?

Dr. ROHWER. That is correct.

Mr. TABER. And you got \$1,250,000?

Dr. ROHWER. Yes, sir; \$1,250,000.

Mr. TABER. When did you find out that you had 5,000,000 acres to deal with?

Dr. ROHWER. Along the latter part of June this year, Congressman Taber.

Mr. TABER. Not until then?

Dr. ROHWER. The grasshoppers began to hatch out in the range-land area of Montana then.

Mr. TABER. How did you find this out?

Dr. ROHWER. All we had to do was get out and go over the area and find grasshoppers. There were grasshoppers there by the millions.

Mr. TABER. That is all.

Mr. KERR. Gentlemen, you will be excused. Thank you, Doctor, for your appearance.

X

81ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 327

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 27, 1949

Mr. KERR introduced the following joint resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making an additional appropriation for control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases.

1 *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives*
2 *of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 *That the following sum is hereby appropriated, out of any*
4 *money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the*
5 *fiscal year ending June 30, 1950.*

6 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

7 BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

8 For an additional amount for "Control of emergency
9 outbreaks of insects and plant diseases", \$1,500,000.

81ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 327

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making an additional appropriation for control
of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant
diseases.

By Mr. KERR

JULY 27, 1949

Referred to the Committee on Appropriations

CONTROL OF EMERGENCY OUTBREAKS OF INSECTS AND PLANT DISEASES

JULY 27, 1949.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State
of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the
following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H. J. Res. 327]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases administered by the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, Department of Agriculture.

The committee is recommending an additional amount of \$1,500,-000, a reduction of \$2,000,000 in the budget estimate of \$3,500,000, for the control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases for the fiscal year 1950. The Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1950 carries the amount of \$1,495,000 for this purpose which, together with the amount recommended in the accompanying joint resolution, will provide a total of \$2,995,000.

This appropriation is made necessary principally by the heavy infestation of grasshoppers in the States of Montana and Wyoming and in certain scattered areas in the States of Nevada, California, Arizona, Texas, Kansas, Colorado, and Nebraska. It was testified that approximately 65 percent of the amount heretofore appropriated and currently requested would be utilized in the control and eradication of the grasshopper in the areas above-mentioned. The balance of the funds were to be used, in the main, in the continued work in connection with the white-fringed beetle, the hall scale, and for surveys generally on insects and plant diseases.

The committee was informed that an area of approximately 2,700,-000 acres of grasslands and croplands have been treated in connection with the grasshopper-eradication program and that an equal amount of acreage remains to be treated. Accordingly, the committee feels that the rate of expenditure for this purpose, as well as for the control

of other insects and plant diseases does not justify an additional appropriation in excess of \$1,500,000. While it was testified that much work is performed during the winter months in the way of surveys the control work actually is concentrated in a period of approximately 2½ months beginning in the latter part of April and ending in the latter part of June. The committee recognizes the fact that control of the species of grasshopper found in the heavily infested areas of Wyoming and Montana may be continued during the summer months, it is nonetheless of the opinion that an amount in excess of that recommended cannot be wisely and economically expended.

The Department has expended, beginning with fiscal year 1938 and through fiscal year 1949, something in excess of \$21,000,000 for the control and eradication of grasshoppers. It is, however, with some surprise that the committee learns that this is the first request made for the control of the grasshopper at the source which, according to testimony of departmental witnesses, is known, and has been known for sometime, to be the area of Wyoming and Montana so heavily infested at the present time. It is in this area that the major portion of funds requested will be expended.

The committee is not convinced that sufficient effort is being exerted to secure additional financial cooperation from the States and counties. The States of Wyoming and Montana have thus far appropriated a total of \$200,000 to be matched by the counties affected, and in turn to be matched by the Federal Government. However, it should be stated that the amount appropriated by the two States was determined at a time when the Department of Agriculture estimated that only 1,500,000 acres of land were to be treated. It would seem to the committee, now that the extent of the infestation is so much greater than originally expected, additional contribution should be forthcoming from the States, counties, and local interests affected. No evidence has been furnished the committee that, prior to requesting Federal appropriations or prior to embarking on a program of grasshopper control, attempts were made to secure additional State or other cooperation and financial participation. While much of the land that is to be treated is public domain and a responsibility of the Federal Government, it is reasonable to expect that all activity on State or privately owned land should be on a strictly cooperative and matching basis.



Union Calendar No. 458

81st CONGRESS
1st Session

H. J. RES. 327

[Report No. 1132]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 27, 1949

Mr. KERR introduced the following joint resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JULY 27, 1949

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making an additional appropriation for control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases.

1 *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives*
2 *of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sum is hereby appropriated, out of any
4 money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the
5 fiscal year ending June 30, 1950:

6 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

7 BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

8 For an additional amount for "Control of emergency
9 outbreaks of insects and plant diseases", \$1,500,000.

81st CONGRESS H. J. RES. 327
1st Session

[Report No. 1132]

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making an additional appropriation for control
of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant
diseases.

By MR. KERR

JULY 27, 1949

Referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JULY 27, 1949

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on
the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. JACKSON of Washington changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago I asked that an opinion from the Legal Department of the Library of Congress be inserted in the body of the RECORD. I was uncertain as to whether or not my request was granted. I am advised that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] objected. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent, after having spoken to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] that this document may be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD and that I may have permission to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

INSECTS AND PLANT DISEASES

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 327, making an additional appropriation for control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is it proposed that this will be taken up in the House as in Committee of the Whole? This will require some explanation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that House Joint Resolution 327, making an additional appropriation for control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases, be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR]?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Reserving the right to object, will that mean we will have an opportunity to discuss the matter?

The SPEAKER. It will be considered under the 5-minute rule.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the following sum is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

For an additional amount for "Control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases", \$1,500,000.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the joint resolution before you provides the amount of \$1,500,000 for the control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases under the Department of Agriculture. This amount is made necessary principally as a result of emergency outbreaks of grasshoppers in the States of Wyoming and Montana and in certain scattered areas in the States of Nevada, California, Arizona, Texas, Kansas, Colorado, and Nebraska.

Witnesses testified that of the amount of \$1,495,000 appropriated for the fiscal year 1950, nearly the entire amount had been expended in fighting the infestation in these areas. The rate of expenditure at the present time, according to testimony, is in the neighborhood of \$200,000 a day on the days that bait is purchased which, however, is only three or four times a month. Contract obligations for the hiring of aircraft used in spreading the bait is about \$30,000 a day.

On the basis of these expenditures, it is believed that the amount recommended will carry the Department through the grasshopper season. An area of 2,700,000 acres has already been treated, and approximately the same number of acres still remain to be treated.

The committee was surprised to learn of the small contributions made by the affected States, and we have, accordingly, informed the Department that greater efforts must be made to secure State and county assistance. The States of Wyoming and Montana, for instance, have appropriated only the amount of \$200,000 for this purpose. While approximately 60 percent of the area already treated and to be treated is public domain and a responsibility of the Federal Government, nonetheless, members of the committee feel where the work is done in the interest of the States, counties, and private ranches that additional financial assistance should be insisted upon.

This is the heaviest infestation of grasshoppers experienced for a number of years, and it is believed that a wise expenditure of the amount recommended will decrease the population sufficiently to minimize the destruction this year and reduce the hatching and render the control of this pest easier the following year.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield..

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. How much was requested by the budget for this particular job?

Mr. KERR. Three million five hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That was my understanding. I am asking that for the information of the House. Our Appropriations Committee has allowed only \$1,500,000. Is it the gentleman's understanding that it is entirely within the rights of the Department of Agriculture whether they can spend this entire \$1,500,000 on grasshopper control, or are they forced to expend one-third of it, as some of us believe, in other controls?

Mr. KERR. There is no legislative restriction with respect to that. The Department of Agriculture, which has this under control, can spend it wherever the infestation is worst.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Does the gentleman feel this is a sufficient amount of funds to do this job?

Mr. KERR. Well, we felt that way about it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The Department said they needed \$3,500,000.

Mr. KERR. Yes; that was the amount.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I say with reference to your remarks as to the States and counties affected making appropriations, of course, we know that the hatching grounds are out there in the West, and we in Minnesota, Iowa, and Nebraska are not interested in these flights of grasshoppers coming east. It is really in our States, though, that they do the damage after they leave the breeding grounds back there in Wyoming and Montana. Naturally our people are awake to the fact that the menace is there.

Mr. KERR. The gentleman realizes, of course, that these infested areas are problematical; sometimes they break out where you do not expect them. The committee thought that this \$1,500,000 was sufficient to take care of it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. My sole purpose in asking these questions of the gentleman from North Carolina has been that I want in the RECORD for the other body to see the question of whether or not this sum is sufficient. I would like to have that gone into very thoroughly when the other body does consider this particular appropriation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Speaker, there was appropriated in the first deficiency bill which was passed on the 24th of May \$1,750,000 to be used to get them started on this grasshopper operation. There was also appropriated \$1,495,000 in the regular agriculture bill which became law on the last of June. Down to the 22d of July Dr. Rohwer told us that they had expended that amount, \$1,250,000, for bait and that they had spent out of the \$1,450,000, \$1,116,000 for grasshopper control, and for other activities \$116,130. The activities for grasshopper control would total in connection with this particular drive that they have on in Wyoming and Montana where the heft of this

trouble is, according to their estimates on page 18 of the hearings, \$1,195,000. There were some other activities in which they wanted to engage in other States, but they were smaller activities. We felt that if we gave them \$1,500,000 that that should carry them through, and it was for that reason that the committee recommended this amount. The House, of course, must realize that a department is never satisfied with what it gets; the sky is the limit with them, and even if the break-down does not add up to what they wanted they still want it. But I really feel that if we give them this amount of money that that is all they will need to carry the job along and do it right. When you consider this matter you have to take into consideration that they will have had probably a million and a half dollars more than they used altogether for every activity last year and this should permit them to go a long way.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Is it not a fact that the officials of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine testified that the infestation is much worse than they anticipated when they appeared before the gentleman's committee in May?

Mr. TABER. I think that is probably so. That is why they are planning to spend \$1,195,000 in cleaning up this infested area in Montana and Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. The hearings have been made available just a moment ago and I have not had an opportunity to read them, but according to my information the intensity of grasshoppers is considerably greater than anticipated, and also the infested areas cover nearly 3,000,000 more acres than originally expected. We have no cold rains during the spring and practically every grasshopper hatched and, consequently, the situation got out of control. It took twice as much bait per acre, and, of course, it took more time and money than anyone could possibly anticipate. I doubt if the job has been half completed.

Mr. TABER. They said it was half covered and they expected to cover the rest of it with that amount of money.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I have conferred with the officials of the Department on numerous occasions and I have been informed that at least \$2,500,000 will be needed to do the job. These grasshoppers have done immeasurable damage in Wyoming and Montana, but there is great danger to the entire Mountain States area because these grasshoppers, when matured, can fly upward of 300 miles and, thereby, infest new areas. While I appreciate the action of this committee, nevertheless, I had hoped the appropriation would be larger.

Mr. TABER. Yes, but they went into a lot of other things, too, which they had the money for already.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I want to clear up one other item, if the gentle-

man will permit. The chairman of this committee, Judge KERR, said that the State of Wyoming had appropriated \$110,000 to assist in this program. Is it not a fact that each of the counties in the infested area has assisted in this program and the individual ranchers or farmers, whether they had privately owned land or Government land, have contributed in addition at the rate of 10 cents an acre for the application of this poison bait on their land?

Mr. TABER. I think there are some payments by the counties and by the individual landowners. Some of it is in the nature of work that is furnished by the farmers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. May I say to the gentleman that this program was carried out only where every landowner in blocks up to 20,000 acres joined in paying for every acre that was poisoned, where the counties paid for mixing and loading the bait into airplanes and where the States cooperated; so that the fact of the matter is that the States, the counties, and the individuals have done everything that they have been asked to do to carry out this program.

This infestation is the worst since 1934 and the people of Wyoming have cooperated in every way possible to put the program over. The spreading of bait by airplanes has proved very effective. I may say to the gentleman that the Department proposes to require a higher contribution from the ranchers to be assisted with the funds made available by this appropriation. I assume that is being done because the State funds have been exhausted.

Mr. TABER. They did not tell us anything about that.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I am sure that is the fact.

Mr. TABER. It may be.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the Appropriations Committee has reported this special appropriation to continue the campaign against grasshoppers in the States of Montana and Wyoming where the infestation this year is extremely heavy.

In the affected areas, many thousands of acres of rangeland have been seriously damaged by the insects. As serious as this condition is, the damage the insects can do to croplands in other areas if they are not exterminated before they begin

their migration is of even greater importance.

It is unfortunate that an underestimation of the extent of the infestation has brought about a temporary halt in the eradication campaign due to the exhaustion of funds available for the work. It is important that the additional funds contained in this measure be made available at the earliest possible opportunity. Once the insects begin to lay eggs and to migrate, it is too late to prevent an even more serious infestation next year.

I note that the committee in its report is somewhat critical of the efforts made by the States of Montana and Wyoming and by local interests. I might say in this connection that the legislature of the State of Montana appropriated \$50,000 to be matched by the counties to fight grasshoppers. This appropriation was made before the extent of the infestation was known. The State legislature recessed in March and the State has had no opportunity to make additional appropriations for this purpose, if it were warranted to do so.

I believe the farmers and ranchers in the area are to be commended for the part they have taken in this work. I have no exact figures to offer, but it is known that many hundreds of them have assessed themselves from 10 to 24 cents per acre to spread the poison bait on their lands. Some of them have been pleased to have the help of the Federal Government in this campaign. Some of them have told me they could do a better job without Federal interference.

The work of eradicating these insects is extremely important and I hope that this appropriation, which is needed so badly right now, will be approved by the Congress.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. As I understand it, of this \$1,500,000,000 65 percent will be used for the eradication of grasshoppers. I am also assured by members of the committee, in answer to some inquiries that have been made of me, that in addition to grasshoppers this money will be used for the eradication of the Mormon cricket, which is nothing more nor less than a larger grasshopper, is that true?

Mr. TAEER. That is within the range of this appropriation. The Department has the authority to move in on all of these things. The title of the appropriation is "Control of emergency outbreak of insect and plant diseases" so that it would cover those items.

Mr. STEFAN. As I understand it, the situation is not as acute as it was in 1931, 1932, and 1934 when there was a grasshopper plague in most of the States of the Middle West. The purpose of this program is to eradicate the grasshoppers which are now in the adult state in order to stop them from flying from their present location.

Mr. TABER. That is what we were told, that the concentrated infestation is in eastern Wyoming and eastern Montana. I think, as a matter of fact, it is northeastern Wyoming and southeastern Montana.

Mr. STEFAN. The report indicates it is also prevalent in some parts of Nebraska.

Mr. TABER. Well, it may spread over into the edges a little, but according to the map it did not indicate very much.

Mr. STEFAN. And the committee felt that \$1,500,000 would be sufficient to stop the grasshoppers going into other locations.

Mr. TABER. That is right.

Mr. STEFAN. And you did not need the amount of money at the time this infestation was in approximately 24 States.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I have considerable doubt of the propriety of bringing a bill of this kind before the Congress without an opportunity for full discussion and without a full understanding of it. I address myself particularly to the Representatives, Mr. Speaker, of some of the Southern States.

The program for the elimination of grasshoppers—and in that classification is included the Mormon cricket—began about 1935, and has been a fairly successful program. This year there was a much greater infestation than before. It is not an emergency situation in the sense that nobody knew about it because the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART], who is sitting directly in front of me, appeared, I recall, before the Senate subcommittee in connection with the third deficiency appropriation bill, so that I think there is time or should be time for us to find out just what we are doing.

I shall vote for the bill. I do not think—and what I say could easily be confirmed—I do not think there will be the mathematical division of the funds between the objectives that has been expressed upon this floor today, either by the chairman or by other members of the committee.

These programs are carried out in conjunction with the State, and I rise, Mr. Speaker, to state that I am very much in favor of that. I have never held the idea which may be expressed as a theory that if the neighbors have chickenpox, and when your children get chickenpox, you should not spend anything on it because they got it from the neighbors. I have argued in my own State regarding contributions from that State in connection with insect infestations against which, I believe, the States should make larger contributions.

I want to point out, particularly to the gentlemen from Louisiana, Florida, North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and other Southern States, that there will not be the money in this bill which I think they believe is in the bill for the continued operation of the white-fringe-beetle program or Hall scale. Hall scale is pretty well under control. The white-fringe beetle has been under control recently. It is a root borer that is very damaging to cotton, potatoes, and some

other crops. My point is that I am not objecting to the bill, but I want it thoroughly understood that, in my opinion, there will not be the money in this bill, when it is divided, to take care of the control of grasshoppers, or, if it is used for that, then the money will not be there for the carrying on of the annual program which has been carried on in the Southern States against the other insects which are recited in the bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, has the gentleman found out yet what a white-fringe beetle is?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Yes. The gentlemen had a pretty good idea in the committee meeting, but thought we should have more information.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, why does not the gentleman from California specifically state, then, that this is for grasshoppers and not for the pest controls that we have in other sections?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman from California is discussing a resolution which has been printed and is before the Congress. About \$1,000,000 of this money will be used, perhaps, on the infestation of grasshoppers.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to use only an additional fraction of a minute to bring to the Members of the House something which is new in these discussions. We have new infestations in the United States which are increasingly dangerous and which are not insects. I am now taking the matter up with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], and with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], and others who are interested in this, to see if we can devise a definition which covers some of the pests which are more dangerous than ever before, without opening wide the doors to unlimited and uncontrolled appropriations.

I think it should be made a matter of record today that in my belief it will not be possible to divide the money satisfactorily as it is proposed by the subcommittee reporting House Joint Resolution 327.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COAST GUARD

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4566) to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 14 of the United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 18, line 6, under the heading "\$ 186. Civilian instructors", strike out "instructions" and insert "instructors."

Page 22, under "425. Retiring boards." Insert:

"SPECIAL PROVISIONS"

"431. Personnel of former Life Saving Service.

"432. Personnel of former Lighthouse Service.

"433. Personnel of former Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation and Bureau of Customs."

Page 41, after line 4, Insert:

"SPECIAL PROVISIONS"

Page 41, after line 4, insert:

"431. Personnel of former Life Saving Service

"(a) If any keeper or member of a crew of a Coast Guard station shall be so disabled by reason of any wound or injury received or disease contracted in the Coast Guard in the line of duty as to unfit him for the performance of duty, such disability to be determined in such manner as shall be prescribed in the regulations of the Coast Guard, he shall be continued upon the rolls of the Coast Guard and entitled to receive his full pay during the continuance of such disability, not to exceed the period of 1 year, unless the Commandant shall recommend, upon a statement of facts, the extension of the period through a portion or the whole of another year, and said recommendation receive the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury as just and reasonable; but in no case shall said disabled keeper or member of a crew be continued upon the rolls or receive pay for a longer period than 2 years.

"(b) Any individual who served in the former Life Saving Service of the United States as a keeper or surfman, and who on account of being so disabled by reason of a wound or injury received or disease or loss of sight contracted in such service in line of duty as to unfit him for the performance of duty was continued upon the rolls of the service for an aggregate period of 1 year or more under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, and who ceased to be a member of such service on account of such disability, which disability has been continuous up to and including April 14, 1930, shall, upon making due proof of such facts in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, be awarded compensation for such injury at the rate of 100 percent of the pay he was receiving at the time of his separation from such service, such compensation to commence from April 14, 1940, and continue during his natural life. No such individual shall receive a pension, pay, or other allowance under any other law of the United States for the same period for which he receives retired pay under the provisions of this section.

"(c) No agent, attorney, or other person engaged in preparing, presenting, or prosecuting any claim under the provisions of subsection (b) of this section shall, directly or indirectly, contract for, demand, receive, or retain for such services in preparing, presenting, or prosecuting such claim a sum greater than \$10, which sum shall be payable only on the order of the Secretary of the Treasury; and any person who shall violate any of the provisions of this subsection, or shall wrongfully withhold from the claimant the whole or any part of retired pay allowed or due such claimant under said subsection, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall, for each and every offense, be fined not exceeding \$500 or be imprisoned not exceeding 1 year, or both, in the discretion of the court."

Page 41, after line 4, Insert:

"§ 432. Personnel of former Lighthouse Service

"(a) Any person of the former Lighthouse Service commissioned as an officer in the Coast Guard shall be an extra number in his grade and in the grades to which he may be promoted. He shall take precedence (1) with other officers commissioned in his grade from the former Lighthouse Service as the Secretary of the Treasury may determine, and (2) with other line officers in his grade in accordance with the respective dates of their commissions in such grade. He shall be eligible for promotion, if otherwise qualified, at such time as the officer in a regular number in line of promotion next above him on the seniority list becomes eligible for promotion; or if there be no such officer in his grade, he shall be eligible for promotion, if otherwise qualified, when a vacancy occurs in the next higher grade. An officer so commissioned shall be assigned to duty for which he is specially qualified, and professional examinations for promotion given to such officer shall embrace only subjects which pertain to the duty to which he is assigned.

"(b) Each vacancy (1) hereafter occurring in the extra numbers of such officers; (2) existing on August 5, 1939, in positions in the Lighthouse Service formerly held by personnel eligible for such commissions; and (3) created by the retirement, resignation, death, or separation from the service for any other cause, of such personnel who do not possess the qualifications prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, or who, being qualified, do not accept a commission thereunder, shall operate to increase by one the total authorized number of line officers of the Coast Guard.

"(c) All persons of the former Lighthouse Service commissioned, appointed, or enlisted in the Coast Guard shall be subject to all laws and regulations for the government of the Coast Guard, and nothing contained in this title shall be construed to prevent the application to any of such persons of laws and regulations concerning the military discipline of commissioned and warrant officers and enlisted men of the Coast Guard.

"(d) In computing length of service, for the purpose of retirement in the Coast Guard, of any person of the former Lighthouse Service commissioned, appointed, or enlisted in the Coast Guard, there shall be included all service computable for retirement under the provisions of section 763 of title 33; and after July 1, 1948, in computing longevity for the purpose of pay of such person there shall be included all service of such person in the Lighthouse Service.

"(e) No person so commissioned, appointed, or enlisted in the Coast Guard shall suffer any reduction in the total of the annual compensation and allowances which he was receiving on the date of his commission, appointment, or enlistment. Upon his retirement from active duty in the Coast Guard, the retired pay of any person so commissioned, appointed, or enlisted, shall not be less than an annuity computed in accordance with the provisions of section 763 of title 33, substituting, however, for purposes of such computation, the annual compensation which he was receiving on the date of his commission, appointment, or enlistment in the Coast Guard for the average annual pay received by him for the last 5 years of service.

"(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the civil-service classification laws and titles II and III of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 shall not apply to civilian keepers of lighthouses and to civilians employed on lightships and other vessels of the Coast Guard.

"(g) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Coast Guard may prescribe the hours of duty and the pay of civilian keepers of lighthouses and civilians employed on lightships and other ves-

sels of the Coast Guard, but such personnel may be called upon for duty in emergency circumstances or otherwise at any time or all times. The existing system governing the pay of such employees may be continued or changed except that overtime compensation, night differential, and extra pay for duty on holidays shall not be paid to such employees. In lieu thereof additional annual compensation may be authorized, which may be prescribed either as a fixed differential or as a percentage of the basic compensation otherwise applicable to such employees. In no case shall basic compensation exceed \$3,750 per annum, except that nothing contained in this subsection shall operate to decrease the basic compensation of any person employed by the Coast Guard on the date of enactment of this subsection, and in no case shall additions thereto exceed 25 percent of such basic compensation. Provision may be made for compensatory absence from duty when conditions of employment result in confinement because of isolation or in long periods of continuous duty; and provisions may likewise be made for extra allowance for service outside of the continental limits of the United States.

"The additional compensation authorized herein shall be included in any computation of compensation for purposes of the Lighthouse Service Retirement Act."

Page 41, after line 4, insert:

"§ 433. Personnel of former Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation and Bureau of Customs

"(a) Included in the 2,250 commissioned officers authorized by section 42 of this title shall be 453 extra numbers to which the President is authorized to appoint only the personnel of the former Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation and Bureau of Customs who on March 1, 1942, held the civil-service rating of CAF-9 or P-3, or above. In the event that any person from among the personnel eligible to fill such extra numbers does not qualify, or who, being qualified does not accept a commission, the extra numbers not so filled shall be reserved pending the separation of such persons from the Coast Guard by retirement, transfer, resignation, death, or other cause. Upon such separation, each vacancy so reserved, and each vacancy created by the unavailability for appointment of such personnel, or by the retirement, resignation, death, or other separation from the active military service of the Coast Guard of such personnel, shall increase by one the authorized number of line officers, and decrease by one the authorized number of extra numbers.

"(b) Any person commissioned from the personnel of the former Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation and Bureau of Customs who on March 1, 1942, held civil-service rating of CAF-9 or P-3, or above, shall be an extra number in any rank to which he may be promoted. He shall be eligible for promotion, if otherwise qualified, at such time as the regular line officer who is his running mate becomes eligible for promotion, and shall be examined only with respect to those qualifications which pertain to his specialty.

"(c) No personnel of the former Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation and Bureau of Customs who were transferred from those bureaus to the Coast Guard by Executive Order 9083 and by Reorganization Plan No. 3, effective July 16, 1946, shall be required to undergo further professional, physical, or mental examinations as a prerequisite to original commissioning, appointment, or enlistment, and the physical standards for such personnel while serving in the Regular Coast Guard shall not be greater than those applicable generally to civilian employees under civil-service laws and regulations.

"(d) Any personnel of the former Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation and

Bureau of Customs transferred from those bureaus to the Coast Guard by Executive Order 9083 and by Reorganization Plan No. 3, effective July 16, 1946, who enlist in the Coast Guard shall be subject to the provisions of subsections (c), and (c)-(h) of this section.

"(e) Accrued military leave of any personnel of the former Bureau of Marine Inspection and Bureau of Customs transferred from those bureaus to the Coast Guard by Executive Order 9083 and by Reorganization Plan No. 3, effective July 16, 1946, who are members of the Coast Guard Reserve or the Naval Reserve on active duty, and who are commissioned, appointed, or enlisted, shall be credited to them upon such commissioning, appointment, or enlistment.

"(f) In computing length of service for purposes of retirement of personnel of the former Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation and Bureau of Customs transferred from those bureaus to the Coast Guard by Executive Order 9083 and by Reorganization Plan No. 3, effective July 16, 1946, who are commissioned, appointed, or enlisted, there shall be included, in addition to all service now or hereafter creditable by law, all service as a civilian employee of the United States within the purview of sections 691, 693, 698, 707, 709-715, 716-719, 720-725, 727-729, 730, 731, and 723 of title 5, such service to be classified as commissioned, warrant, or enlisted depending upon which status the person assumes upon his entry into the Regular Coast Guard. Service covering the same period shall not be counted more than once.

"(g) Any such person shall not be entitled to any retirement benefits under any laws relating to the retirement of civilian personnel of the Federal Government, but shall be entitled upon claim therefor to a return of the total contributions made by him to the retirement fund with interest thereon and, in addition, to eligibility for retirement benefits provided by law for members of the Regular Coast Guard, he shall, if his total service in the Federal Government, civil plus military, is 15 years or over, be entitled, upon reaching the statutory retirement age for military personnel of the Regular Coast Guard, to retirement pay amounting to 75 percent of his active-duty pay at the time of such retirement; and, in the administration of applicable laws for physical disability retirement, a disability shall be deemed to have been incurred incident to Coast Guard service if the cause of such disability is not due to vicious habits, intemperance, or misconduct.

"(h) No personnel of the former Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation and Bureau of Customs transferred from those bureaus to the Coast Guard by Executive Order 9083 and by Reorganization Plan No. 3, effective July 16, 1946, who are commissioned, appointed, or enlisted in the Coast Guard shall suffer any reduction in annual compensation, including allowances, below the compensation applicable to his permanent civil-service position at the time of such commissioning, appointment, or enlistment, exclusive of overtime compensation, and the civil-service status, tenure, seniority, and compensation of any such person who for any reason is not commissioned, appointed, or enlisted under the provisions of said sections shall not be impaired by reason of said sections."

Page 49, line 2, strike out all after "device," down to and including "ribbon." In line 6.

Page 49, line 2, under the heading "§ 496. Time limit on award; report concerning deed", strike out "Coast Guard commendation ribbon."

Page 49, line 2, under the heading "§ 497. Honorable subsequent service as condition to award", strike out "Coast Guard commendation ribbon."

CONTROL OF EMERGENCY OUTBREAKS OF INSECTS AND PLANT DISEASES

JULY 28 (legislative day, JUNE 2), 1949.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted
the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H. J. Res. 327]

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 327) making an additional appropriation for control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases, report the same to the Senate with an amendment and recommend its passage.

The committee recommend that in line 9 of House Joint Resolution 327 the figure "\$1,500,000" be deleted and the figure "\$3,500,000" be inserted in lieu thereof.

The increase of \$2,000,000 proposed by the committee will provide the full amount of the budget estimate, \$3,500,000, as contained in Senate Document No. 98.

The budget estimate upon which this proposed appropriation is based states in part as follows:

Serious infestations of grasshoppers are occurring in many sections in a number of States from the Mississippi River westward. The intensity and extent of the infestations far exceed those expected when funds were requested for the fiscal year 1950.

It is essential that control work go forward at a high tempo if crops and ranges are to be protected and a much more extensive outbreak averted in the crop year 1950.

At the present rate of expenditure, available funds will be exhausted before the end of July. To complete the necessary control program an additional \$3,500,000 is urgently needed.

The committee is advised by the Secretary of Agriculture that under the additional appropriation of \$1,500,000 proposed by the House an additional amount of only \$495,000 would be available for grasshopper control. This would make it necessary to discontinue immediately the cooperative control program on range lands in Montana and Wyoming where much of the land is public domain,

and it would also be necessary to discontinue the plan to cooperate on a 50-50 basis in the State of Arizona to control grasshoppers on about 200,000 acres of range land in the southeastern part of Arizona.

The following letter from the Secretary of Agriculture is made a part of this report:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, July 27, 1949.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Deficiency Appropriations.

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: The House of Representatives approved today House Joint Resolution 327 which would provide for an additional amount of \$1,500,000 for control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases. A budget estimate of \$3,500,000 for this item was submitted on July 7 (S. Doc. 98), and representatives of the Department appeared before your committee on July 18 in support of this estimate.

The House committee report on House Joint Resolution 327 stated in part as follows:

"This appropriation is made necessary principally by the heavy infestation of grasshoppers in the States of Montana and Wyoming and in certain scattered areas in the States of Nevada, California, Arizona, Texas, Kansas, Colorado, and Nebraska. It was testified that approximately 65 percent of the amount heretofore appropriated and currently requested would be utilized in the control and eradication of the grasshopper in the areas above-mentioned. The balance of the funds were to be used, in the main, in the continued work in connection with the white-fringed beetle, the Hall scale, and for surveys generally on insects and plant diseases.

"The committee was informed that an area of approximately 2,700,000 acres of grasslands and croplands have been treated in connection with the grasshopper eradication program and that an equal amount of acreage remains to be treated. Accordingly, the committee feels that the rate of expenditure for this purpose, as well as for the control of other insects and plant diseases does not justify an additional appropriation in excess of \$1,500,000."

The following tabulation shows the current situation on funds for these activities in the fiscal year 1950:

Regular annual appropriation act for 1950 (excluding \$250,000 transferred to Forest Pest Control Act) - - -	\$1,495,000
H. J. Res. 327 - - -	1,500,000
	<hr/>
	\$2,995,000
Less amounts required to finance for the fiscal year 1950 the following:	
White-fringed beetle control - - -	- 865,000
Hall scale eradication - - -	- 135,000
General surveys to detect and appraise insect infestations - - -	- 200,000
	<hr/>
	- 1,200,000
Balance available for grasshopper control - - -	1,795,000
Obligated for grasshopper control as of July 26, 1949 - - -	1,300,000
	<hr/>
Additional amount which would be available for grasshopper control in 1950 under H. J. Res. 327 - - -	495,000

The additional \$495,000 that would be provided for grasshopper control during fiscal year 1950 by House Joint Resolution 327 would make it necessary to:

1. Discontinue immediately the cooperative control program on range lands in Montana and Wyoming where much of the land is public domain.

2. Discontinue the plan to cooperate on a 50-50 basis in the State of Arizona to control grasshoppers on about 200,000 acres of range land in the southeastern part of that State.

The grasshopper-control program for the remainder of the current season would be restricted to cooperation with States in the protection of cultivated crops.

Such work would be carried out mainly in the following general areas: Northwestern and northeastern Montana; northwestern North Dakota; western Minnesota; central Wisconsin; western Kansas and Nebraska; eastern Colorado; northwestern Texas; three areas in California; and smaller areas in Oregon, Illinois, Indiana, and Michigan.

Only a small amount of funds would be left to carry on surveys in the fall of 1949 to appraise the grasshopper situation, and unless funds were provided later in the fiscal year, it would be necessary to discontinue the cooperative grasshopper control program about December 31, 1949.

In view of the national importance of the cooperative grasshopper control program, and the urgency of a congressional determination on its continuance at an effective level which would prevent wide dissemination from present areas of concentration, it is recommended that the Senate increase House Joint Resolution 327 to \$3,500,000, the amount of the budget estimate.

Sincerely,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN, *Secretary.*



81st CONGRESS
1st SESSION

H. J. RES. 327

[Report No. 794]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 28 (legislative day, JUNE 2), 1949

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JULY 28 (legislative day, JUNE 2), 1949

Reported by Mr. MCKELLAR, with an amendment; considered, amended, read the third time, and passed

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making an additional appropriation for control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases.

1 *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives*
2 *of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sum is hereby appropriated, out of any
4 money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the
5 fiscal year ending June 30, 1950:

6 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

7 BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

8 For an additional amount for "Control of emergency
9 outbreaks of insects and plant diseases", ~~\$1,500,000~~
10 \$3,500,000.

Passed the House of Representatives July 27, 1949.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk.



81ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 327

[Report No. 794]

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making an additional appropriation for control
of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant
diseases.

JULY 28 (legislative day, JUNE 2), 1949

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Appropriations

JULY 28 (legislative day, JUNE 2), 1949

Reported with an amendment; considered, amended,
read the third time, and passed

Treasury Department, he is authorized by statute and Executive order to act as Secretary, in the absence of the Secretary of the Treasury, to the same extent as an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

The assistant general counsel for the Bureau of Internal Revenue (popularly known as the chief counsel of the Bureau) is also appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The salary for each of these positions is \$10,330 per annum.

The general counsel of the Department is charged with the supervision and coordination of one of the largest legal staffs of the Government, dealing with most important functions in the domestic and international fiscal and economic fields and related administrative and enforcement activities. There are over 500 lawyers under his general supervision in all the various branches and activities of the Treasury Department. These include such administrative units as the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the Bureau of Customs, Coast Guard, Office of International Finance, Bureau of Public Debt, and Comptroller of the Currency, as well as the many other activities of the Treasury Department.

The chief counsel of the Bureau of Internal Revenue is charged with all the legal problems attendant upon the collection of over \$40,000,000,000 annually in revenues. Fair and effective administration of our complex tax laws places upon his shoulders a responsibility in this field second only to that of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. By statute he is charged with direct responsibility for the supervision and coordination of a staff of over 400 lawyers in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, located in Washington and in many field offices throughout the country.

The responsibilities of the general counsel of the Treasury Department and the chief counsel of the Bureau of Internal Revenue are acknowledged as being among the greatest of any of the legal offices of the Government, requiring for effective administration a degree of technical competence and administrative ability greater than most any of the professional positions in the private practice of law which bring personal recompense many times over the \$10,000 salaries now awarded those positions.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolutions were each read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 3829. An act to provide assistance for local school agencies in providing educational opportunities for children on Federal reservations or in defense areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases; and

H. J. Res. 329. Joint resolution amending an act making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

ALLEGED INVASION OF SOVEREIGN RIGHTS BY REGULATION OF MONEY SPENT ABROAD—ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK WORLD-TELEGRAM

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Sovereign Rights Not Necessarily Invaded if We Have Say on How Much Is Spent Abroad," written by Ralph Hendershot and published in the New York World-Telegram of July 27, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BRITISH MEDICAL CARE PLAN—REPORT BY JOHN G. HILL

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a report en-

titled "Has Britain Shown That Health Insurance Can Work?", written by John G. Hill, director of research, health and welfare council of Philadelphia, Pa., which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

SPEECHES BEFORE AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION, FULL EMPLOYMENT CONFERENCE

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a series of speeches delivered before the Americans for Democratic Action, Full Employment Conference, held in Washington, D. C., on July 19, 1949, together with a resolution adopted at that conference, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE EXCISE TAX ON FURS

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter received by him from Mr. Alfred A. Greenhood, of Baltimore, Md., relative to the excise tax on furs, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR CONTROL OF EMERGENCY OUTBREAKS OF INSECTS AND PLANT DISEASES

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, the House has passed House Joint Resolution 327, making an additional appropriation for control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases. The joint resolution makes provision for an additional appropriation for control of grasshoppers. The joint resolution came to the Senate from the House a short time ago. The Senate Appropriations Committee has considered the joint resolution and, at the request of the Secretary of Agriculture, has increased the amount carried in the measure from \$1,500,000 to \$3,500,000.

I now report the joint resolution favorably from the Committee on Appropriations, with an amendment, to strike \$1,500,000 and insert \$3,500,000, and I submit a report (No. 794) thereon.

By reason of the urgency of the situation, I now ask unanimous consent that the House joint resolution, which has just been reported from the committee be immediately considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. If I correctly understand, this is the so-called emergency grasshopper relief bill.

Mr. MCKELLAR. It is.

Mr. WHERRY. The House has passed the joint resolution and it came to the Senate, and was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and reported from the committee with an amendment; and by reason of the emergency of the situation, and the need for additional money, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is asking for immediate consideration?

Mr. MCKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I want to commend the Committee on Appropriations for its prompt action on the measure and to endorse the request of the chairman for immediate consideration. I do not know what the situation is in other States with respect to the grasshopper pest, but,

insofar as my State of Illinois is concerned, the situation is very serious. I am very happy that the Senate committee has taken action to increase the amount for the control of this pest.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I thank the Senator from Illinois; and I express the hope that the joint resolution may be considered immediately and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 327) making an additional appropriation for control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with an amendment on page 1, line 9, after the word "diseases", to strike out "\$1,500,000" and insert "\$3,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

Mr. MCKELLAR subsequently said: Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. YOUNG conferees on the part of the Senate.

FOREIGN-AID APPROPRIATIONS—NOTICE OF MOTION TO RECONSIDER VOTE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on page 10478 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday appears the vote by which the Senate did not sustain the ruling of the Chair. The RECORD will show that I voted on the prevailing side. At this time I serve notice that I shall move to reconsider the vote by which the ruling of the Chair was not sustained.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—COMMENTS ON HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared, including comments by the Department of Commerce on the Hoover Commission recommendations as they affect that Department.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHN L. McCLELLAN, CHAIRMAN, SENATE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, released today a summary of a 70-page report compiled by the Department of Commerce, strongly endorsing recommendations of the Hoover Commission which affect that Department.

The report is in general agreement with the Hoover Commission objective of em-

bracing all of the activities of the Federal Government relating to the development of industry, transportation, and commerce within the Department of Commerce. The Secretary of Commerce, in submitting the report, stated that such proposal is "in accord with sound principles of Federal organization and would lead to the many improvements which would come from a major grouping of similar functions and purposes. * * * It is in line with the original purposes laid down by the Congress at the time the Department was created."

The report is divided into seven basic categories, transportation, the merchant marine, civil aviation, highway transportation, railroad transportation, commercial fisheries, and departmental management.

Commenting on the proposed consolidation of most of the nonregulatory transportation functions in the Department, the report concurs with the findings of the Hoover Commission, stating that:

"Adoption of the general program advanced by the Commission would result in a far greater degree of unity both in policy formulation and in the administration of transportation functions that exists at the present time. It should be pointed out, however, that in our judgment the complete adoption of the Hoover Commission recommendations would not automatically result in completely unified national transportation policy."

* * * In the absence of any proposal for a separate Department of Transportation we are also inclined to believe that the Department of Commerce probably represents the most appropriate agency for the location of these functions. This Department has as one of its major purposes the mandate to foster and promote the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States. In carrying out this legislative mandate the Department already engages in a variety of transportation activities and is at the same time analyzing the entire transportation system of the country from the standpoint of determining how well it meets the needs of commerce. These existing activities are certainly closely related to the over-all planning and programming functions which the Hoover Commission considers essential activities for the enlarged Department of Commerce which it proposes."

The report cites but one exception, that of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics which transfer the Department believes cannot be sustained on logical grounds. The Secretary stated that inasmuch as almost all of the research now conducted by the NACA is for military purposes, and since it is unlikely that any future work will have civilian air transport application, there seems little reason to transfer this organization to the Department. The suggestion is also made that further study be given the problem of organizing Federal scientific research before any change is made in the current status of the NACA.

The Department opposes a portion of the recommendation which leaves with the Civil Aeronautics Board a review function over the promulgation of air-safety regulations. The Department feels that these functions should be transferred to the Department in their entirety in order that the possibility of overlapping be reduced commenting as follows:

"The Department is of the opinion that the Civil Aeronautics Administration is the proper agency to promulgate air-safety regulations. It has a large and well-qualified technical staff stationed throughout the United States, its territories and possessions. The staff is in everyday contact with all phases of the industry, is familiar with all types of operating problems, and is currently dealing with the latest technical developments in the field. This specialized, current, and practical knowledge would make it pos-

sible for the Civil Aeronautics Administration to promulgate workable, effective, and timely air-safety regulations. * * *

The Department expresses apprehension relative to the adoption of the Hoover Commission recommendations dealing with subsidies, but, in connection with the proposed concentration of over-all route programs for air, land, and water transportation, proposes to "perform a critical evaluation of all promotional activities of the Federal Government to evolve a balanced program." In summing up its position, the Department states:

"Entrusting the general planning and programming function to the Department is desirable, but fulfillment of these functions probably would involve difficulties with the regulatory commissions so long as the granting of shipping subsidies is left in the hands of the Maritime Commission and the granting of airline subsidies is left to the Civil Aeronautics Board. * * * While the Department is willing to accept the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and appear before the regulatory agencies in support of the general plans and programs which it evolves, it would like to point out that there would not necessarily result a unified and coordinated program with respect to the granting of subsidies. The regulatory commissions might in general follow policies which were in substantial accord with the program suggested by the Department, but it is equally possible that they might adopt quite different and conflicting policies. As a result the prospects of achieving a balanced promotional program are greatly diminished and the possibility of difficulties between the Department and the regulatory commissions is enhanced. In fact, there might develop sharp conflicts of view between the Department supporting a balanced transportation program and the individual regulatory commissions adopting policies calculated to favor the particular area of transport over which they have jurisdiction."

The transfer of the Coast Guard, the business operations of the Maritime Commission, and the marine functions of the Bureau of Customs to the Department of Commerce is supported. The following extract from the report indicates the Department's views:

"Close relationships with units already in the Department or proposed for transfer to the Department lend support to the view that the Coast Guard might appropriately be lodged in the Department. In reaching this decision we recognize that the Coast Guard performs some auxiliary activities of value to the Treasury Department, and stands in readiness to perform a variety of functions for the Military Establishment in time of war. Since the bulk of the Coast Guard's activities, however, have a close and intimate connection with transportation it appears preferable to place that agency with other transportation organizations rather than to leave it in the Treasury Department or to transfer it to the National Military Establishment. So long as the organization of the Coast Guard is maintained substantially without change, a transfer during time of war to the National Military Establishment could be effected without difficulty. * * *

The Department agrees with the Hoover Commission that most of the functions now supervised by the Maritime Commission are of the character for which unified administration and direction is desirable, commenting on the proposed transfer, as follows:

"The various operating functions, in particular those in connection with the huge Government-owned fleet, can certainly be administered to greater advantage by a single administrator than by a board. The Department thinks that these functions might well be placed within the jurisdiction of the over-all transportation agency of the Government. The same conclusion applies to the training functions of the Commission and this conclusion is strengthened if, as is

also proposed, the activities of the Coast Guard to be transferred to the Department. This follows since there should be a close relationship between the training of seafaring personnel conducted by the Commission and the maintenance of employment standards for this personnel by the Coast Guard."

The Department likewise supports the recommendation for a study of the marine functions of the Bureau of Customs with a view to consolidation with other marine functions within the Department, as follows:

"A preliminary review of the activities of the Bureau of Customs suggests the possibility that certain of the functions which it performs might be consolidated with either those of the Coast Guard or with the functions transferred from the Maritime Commission. The Department is inclined to believe that the section of marine administration, the section of admeasurement, and the section of publications and documents might be transferred in whole or in part without any serious interference with the basic work of the Bureau of Customs. Accordingly, we endorse the idea of having a study made by an impartial group, such as the Bureau of the Budget, with a view to determining which, if any, of these functions appropriately belong in the new transportation organization."

The recommendation which would create within the Department a Bureau of Highway Transportation, to be composed of the Public Roads Administration and the motor carrier safety functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission, is endorsed, as follows:

"The basic activity of the Public Roads Administration—sponsoring the development of an adequate system of public roads through a Federal grant-in-aid program—is parallel to the major activities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration; that is sponsoring and promoting the development of an adequate system of airports through a grant-in-aid program and the actual establishment of airway facilities. The Department is convinced that it is desirable to group these related promotional activities under unified policy and budgetary controls and accordingly agrees with the recommendation of the Hoover Commission that the Public Roads Administration be lodged in the Department. * * * It might also be noted that safety work in the motor-transport field has virtually no connection with the basic task of economic regulation entrusted to the Interstate Commerce Commission. Accordingly, this function could be transferred from the Commission without interfering with the Commission's normal operations."

The Department also supports the creation of a new Bureau of Railroad Transportation composed of the railway safety functions, the car-service functions, the railroad-consolidation-planning functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Office of Defense Transportation. Its conclusions are as follows:

"Preparation of a basic consolidation plan might well be entrusted to the Department, which has over-all responsibility for national transportation programming, and which has particular responsibility for planning route patterns for land, air, and water transport. Since these responsibilities have been recommended for the Department and since the Department has already agreed that it represents the most appropriate agency for the centralized coordination of these planning functions, the Department also believes that it should have the initial responsibility for planning railroad consolidations."

The Department agrees that a considerable part of the fisheries functions has to do directly with commercial operation and international agreements, but points out that it is difficult to distinguish between

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On July 26, 1949:

H. R. 2104. An act relating to orders to banks doing business in the District of Columbia to stop payment on negotiable instruments payable from deposits in, or payable at, such banks; and

H. J. Res. 298. Joint resolution to provide for on-the-spot audits by the General Accounting Office of the fiscal records of the Office of the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives.

On July 28, 1949:

H. R. 3901. An act to increase the salaries of the judges of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the municipal court for the District of Columbia.

On August 1, 1949:

H. R. 4646. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to lend certain property to national veterans' organizations, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases; and

H. J. Res. 329. Joint resolution amending an act making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1950, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5632) entitled "An act to reorganize fiscal management in the National Military Establishment to promote economy and efficiency, and for other purposes."

TEMPORARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1950

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 329, amending an act making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1950, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution and the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 7, strike out "August 31, 1949" and insert "August 15, 1949."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not see the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations on the floor at the moment. I wonder if the gentleman from Missouri will explain the Senate amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the joint resolution, as it passed the House, continued funds for the agencies affected until August 31, 1949. The Senate

amendment changes the date from August 31 to August 15.

Of course, the House is glad to cooperate with the Senate in any proposition to expedite the enactment of the supply bills.

I am, therefore, proposing that the House agree to the Senate amendment with the least possible ceremony and without delay.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTROL OF EMERGENCY OUTBREAKS OF INSECTS AND PLANT DISEASES

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution (H. J. Res. 327) making an additional appropriation for control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON, KERR, RAUBAT, TABER, and WIGGLESWORTH.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

M. L. MELETIO

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, today one of the most courteous, faithful, and efficient employees of the House is resigning after more than 30 years' service as an employee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. M. L. Meletio as a young man attended Smith Academy, and Washington University, in St. Louis. For some time he was connected with the Meletio Seafood Co., founded by his grandfather; he was also owner and publisher of a profitable and influential weekly newspaper in St. Louis County, president of the Broadway Businessmen's Association, and was most successful in many business ventures.

After the loss of his wife and two children in a tragic fire he felt perhaps he would be happier in newer surroundings and accepted an invitation from former Congressman Fred Essen to come to Washington on a 2 weeks' vacation. Mr. Meletio turned down an offer to become chairman of the State Prison Board of Missouri and also an offer to be made chairman of the election board of St. Louis County in order to come to Washington to take a minor position.

As so often happens to people who come here intending to spend only 2 weeks or a brief period, he has spent more than 30 years, serving us diligently not only as pair clerk but also as elected

Doorkeeper in the Eightieth Congress. He was quiet, unassuming, unselfish, dignified, and tried to treat all alike.

It is with regret, of course, that he leaves his many warm friends here in the House and I am sure that the Members are going to miss Mr. Meletio. He has been my close, personal friend for 20 years and I am sure all Members join me in wishing him and his charming wife good health, good fortune, and Godspeed until the end of the perfect day.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to concur in what the gentleman has said about our very good friend, Mel Meletio. In my opinion he has been one of the most useful, helpful assistants and employees that I have ever come across in my time in the Congress. I am sure we are all sorry to see him go; at the same time we wish him every happiness and every success in the future.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] in everything they have said about Mel Meletio.

I have been here practically ever since Mr. Meletio came to the Congress. There are few Members of the House who have more dealings with the men who work behind the desk here than I do.

I want to say what I have said time and time again, and that is that I have never known a more efficient, a more courteous, a more affable or more conscientious employee of the Federal Government than our distinguished friend, Mel Meletio.

I am sorry indeed that he is leaving the service.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in joining with the gentleman from Missouri and others in wishing Godspeed to our friend and very efficient public servant, Mel Meletio, who severs his connection with the House of Representatives today after more than 30 years of splendid, efficient service. He not only served as pair clerk for many years, but he has also served as the chief doorkeeper of the House of Representatives. He takes with him into retirement the friendship and the best wishes of all of us who have known him throughout his many years of service in the House.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks at this point in the RECORD on Mr. Meletio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

M. L. MELETIO RETIRES

Mr. ARENDTS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House that today brings to a close the services of one of our faithful employees who has been with us since Armistice Day in 1918, beginning his career on the Hill as clerk to the Honorable Frederick Essen, a Republican Representative in the Sixty-fifth Congress from St. Louis, Mo. This gentleman has served us faithfully and well and is deserving of his reward that he is now receiving. I refer to our own M. L. Meletio, whom we all called "Mel."

Mr. Meletio, as I have stated, came here as a clerk to a Member of Congress and since that time has served in the following capacities:

Clerk to Congressman Frederick Essen, November 11, 1918, to March 3, 1919.

Deputy Sergeant at Arms in charge of pairs from May 20, 1919, until December 7, 1931.

Minority employee, December 8, 1931, until January 3, 1947.

Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives from January 4, 1947, until January 3, 1949.

Minority employee from January 4, 1949, until he retired at the close of business on yesterday, July 31, 1949.

Mr. Speaker, I know that all of his many friends are happy to hear of this good news and are wishing for our good friends the best of health, the good luck he deserves and, most of all, that he may live and enjoy his life to follow for a long time to come. So I say to you, Mel, "Good luck, Godspeed, and many life's blessings be bestowed upon you for many years to come."

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SHAFFER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ALLEN of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Southern Pines Electric Power Association, Taylorville, Miss.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I was given permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a list, by counties, of the Army men from Mississippi who lost their lives in the recent war. I did not want to confine this merely to my district, and therefore I inserted the list for every county in the State.

It comes back this morning with a statement that it exceeds the limit saying that it will cost \$1,160. As a matter of fact, the cost will only be for the extra paper and the ink. This is something that other Members will want to do. I could limit this list to my own district, but other Members could take it up piecemeal and put their lists in. So, I ask unanimous consent that the list may be inserted regardless of the cost.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an article on the current textile situation by Mr. J. A. Daly, staff writer of the Charlotte News, and in the other an article entitled "Mountain Educators" from the Charlotte Observer.

Mr. MORRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a release dated July 27, 1949, from the Department of the Army, Office of the Chief of Special Services, Information Division, entitled "Army Barber Shop Quartets Planned in New Program."

Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from a magazine.

Mr. TACKETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Arkansas Gazette of July 29, 1949.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HEBERT (at the request of Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Gary Post-Tribune.

Mr. MCSWEENEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Reverend Father Edward S. Hannon, of Wooster, Ohio.

Mr. CROOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Ralph C. Phillippe, Indiana State director, Farmers Home Administration, on the subject of what the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act has meant to Indiana.

Mr. GRANT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include in the first a tribute to the late beloved Associate Justice Frank Murphy by the distinguished journalist and writer, Blair Moody, and in the second a similar tribute by a distinguished lawyer of Detroit, Aaron Kurland. The third extension deals with America and the DP's, and I wish to include an item ap-

pearing in this morning's Washington Post which I deem to be an eloquent statement of the facts as regards the unfortunate DP's and America's relative inactivity in this connection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, at some pains I have condensed an article on the French assignats, the story of inflation in France. I have been informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages in the RECORD and will cost \$220, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

[Mr. POLK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. YATES addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from a newspaper item.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

MINIMUM WAGE LEGISLATION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday next when the minimum wage bill comes before the House we will have the choice of doing one of two things. First we can

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR CONTROL OF EMERGENCY OUTBREAKS OF INSECTS AND PLANT DISEASES

AUGUST 3, 1949.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. CANNON, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. J. Res. 327]

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 327) making an additional appropriation for control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 1:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed insert \$1,750,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

CARL HAYDEN,
ELMER THOMAS,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
CHAN GURNEY,
GUY CORDON,
MILTON R. YOUNG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,

Managers on the Part of the House.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 327) making an additional appropriation for control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to such amendment, namely:

Appropriates \$1,750,000 for control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases instead of \$1,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,

JOHN H. KERR,

LOUIS C. RABAUT,

JOHN TABER,

R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,

Managers on the part of the House.



The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Anderson	Hill	Morse
Baldwin	Hoey	Mundt
Brewster	Holland	Myers
Bricker	Humphrey	Neely
Bridges	Hunt	O'Conor
Butler	Ives	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Jenner	Pepper
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Connally	Kem	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Donnell	Kilgore	Sparkman
Dulles	Knowland	Stennis
Ecton	Langer	Taylor
Ellender	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Long	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	Lucas	Thye
Frear	McCaran	Tobey
Fulbright	McCarthy	Vandenberg
George	McClellan	Watkins
Gillette	McFarland	Wherry
Graham	McGrath	Wiley
Green	McKellar	Williams
Gurney	McMahon	Young
Hayden	Magnuson	
Hendrickson	Maybank	

THE VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question before the Senate is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate? An affirmative vote is a vote to sustain the decision of the Chair; a negative vote is a vote to overrule the decision of the Chair.

MR. LONG. Mr. President, what is the ruling of the Chair?

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The ruling of the Chair is that the amendment is out of order, for the reasons which the Chair stated.

The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called.

MR. SPARKMAN (after having voted in the affirmative). When this bill was before the Senate on a previous occasion I had an arrangement with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] that I would pair with him on the so-called McClellan amendment. It may be that within his understanding that pair still stands. If he were present I understand he would vote "nay" on the pending question. If I were free to vote, I would vote "yea." For the reason stated I withdraw my vote.

MR. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] would vote "yea."

MR. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] and the Senator from Pennsyl-

vania [Mr. MARTIN] are detained on official business.

The result was—yeas 52, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—52

Aiken	Hill	Morse
Anderson	Hoey	Myers
Baldwin	Holland	Neely
Bricker	Humphrey	O'Conor
Bridges	Ives	Pepper
Butler	Jenner	Robertson
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Chapman	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Chavez	Kem	Taylor
Connally	Kerr	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	Kilgore	Thye
Donnell	Knowland	Tobey
Dulles	Langer	Vandenberg
Ecton	Lodge	Wiley
Ellender	Long	Williams
Ferguson	Lucas	
Flanders	Thye	
Frear	McCaran	
Fulbright	McCarthy	
George	McClellan	
Gillette	McFarland	
Graham	McGrath	
Green	McKellar	
Gurney	McMahon	
Hayden	Magnuson	
Hendrickson	Maybank	

NAYS—32

Brewster	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Bricker	Jenner	Mundt
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Butler	Kem	Russell
Cain	Knowland	Schoeppel
Capehart	Langer	Stennis
Chavez	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarthy	Watkins
Ecton	McClellan	Wherry
Ellender	McKellar	Young
Ferguson	Maybank	

NOT VOTING—12

Douglas	Martin	Sparkman
Downey	Miller	Taft
Eastland	Murray	Tydings
Malone	Reed	Withers

THE VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote the yeas are 52, the nays are 32, so the decision of the Chair stands as the judgment of the Senate.

MR. McCLELLAN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

MR. McCLELLAN. Is it in order now to move to suspend the rules, pursuant to notice previously given, or must this amendment wait until action on the other committee amendments is had?

THE VICE PRESIDENT. After advising with the Parliamentarian, the Chair is of the opinion that the amendment would come as an individual amendment now, and probably should await action on the committee amendments. But it will be in order.

MR. McCLELLAN. It was my thought, however, that since a point of order had been made against the amendment and sustained, it would go out of the bill.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator might ask unanimous consent to offer his motion to suspend the rules at this time. Is that what he has in mind?

MR. McCLELLAN. I did not want to lose my right.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will not lose his right.

MR. McCLELLAN. I was merely inquiring about that point.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will not lose his right.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 8, after the word "financing", to strike out "not to exceed \$500,000 shall be available for expenditures of a confidential character (other than entertainment) under the direction of the

Administrator or the Deputy Administrator, who shall make a certificate of the amount of each such expenditure which he may think it advisable not to specify, and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the amount therein specified."

MR. HAYDEN. Mr. President, as originally presented to the Senate from the Committee on Appropriations the sum of \$500,000, appearing in line 8, was reduced to \$200,000. In order to perfect the amendment before it is voted on I offer an amendment in line 8, on page 4, to strike out "\$500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$200,000."

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment to the committee amendment.

THE CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 8 in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$200,000."

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

MR. HAYDEN. Now I suggest the rejection of the committee amendment, as amended.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on the committee amendment, as amended, striking out "\$500,000" and inserting "\$200,000."

MR. HAYDEN. No; the language now is to be stricken out of the bill.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is referring to the House language?

MR. HAYDEN. Yes, the language of the House. Having reduced the amount from \$500,000 to \$200,000, I now suggest that the committee amendment, as amended, be rejected. That will leave the amount of \$200,000.

MR. MCKELLAR. That is entirely satisfactory to me.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the committee amendment, as amended. [Putting the question.] The "noes" seem to have it.

MR. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask for a division. I do not believe the Members of the Senate heard all the colloquy which has just taken place.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Arizona again make his suggestion and will Senators be in order.

MR. HAYDEN. I will explain to the Senate that when the bill was originally reported to the Senate, the House language remained in the bill, except that the Senate committee recommended that the sum be reduced from \$500,000 to \$200,000. So I first offered an amendment to perfect the amendment by reducing the amount from \$500,000 to \$200,000. If we now reject the committee amendment, as amended, the sum will remain at \$200,000.

MR. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

MR. HAYDEN. I yield.

MR. McCARRAN. By rejecting the committee amendment we restore or replace the language that has been stricken out by the committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. We make the sum \$200,000 instead of \$500,000.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, was it the decision of the committee that this reduction be made?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. Was it the unanimous view of the committee?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The same action was taken the other day, was it not?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; we did not get to this the other day.

Mr. MCKELLAR. We did not get that far in the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the committee amendment as amended. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" seem to have it. Apparently what the Senator from Arizona did not want to have done has been done.

Mr. HAYDEN. A negative vote is necessary.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair restate the question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Chair will restate the question. The question is on the committee amendment, as amended by the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona, striking out \$500,000 and reducing the amount to \$200,000.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. A negative vote means that the amendment carries?

The VICE PRESIDENT. A negative vote means that the House language is restored with the reduction from \$500,000 to \$200,000.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I have no objection to that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was rejected.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR CONTROL OF EMERGENCY OUTBREAKS OF INSECTS AND PLANT DISEASES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House Joint Resolution 327, making an additional appropriation for control of emer-

gency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The conference report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 327) making an additional appropriation for control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert, "\$1,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

CARL HAYDEN,
ELMER THOMAS,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
CHAN GURNEY,
GUY CORDON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement which I present to the Senate regarding statehood for Alaska and Hawaii.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

As probably every Member of the Senate is aware, the Hearst newspapers have been making a current poll of the Congress to determine the thinking of all of its membership on the important subject of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii.

The showing made in this canvass, which is now virtually complete, is so overwhelmingly in favor of bringing these two great Territories into the Union that, in my opinion, it should command the attention of the Congress.

The sentiment of the Congress, as indicated by this unofficial poll, is about 3 to 1

in favor of statehood for Hawaii, and I understand that the showing made in favor of Alaskan statehood is almost as good. There has been a strong showing for immediate action. This is what might have been expected, since the Congress has studied the issue intensively for the past 10 years. I believe that in that time there has never been an adverse report submitted by one of its investigating committees. Eight such committees have made visits to the Territories; six to Hawaii and two to Alaska. They have returned to write into the records of the Congress about 4,000 pages of reports setting forth the qualifications of the two territories. I mention this because it is apparent, as this unofficial poll makes clear, that the membership of the two Houses of the Congress is familiar with the issue of statehood for both Territories, and is ready to act.

In the Eighty-first Congress, the House Public Lands Committee reported unanimously in favor of statehood for both territories. I believe that the Rules Committee of that body has not reported the bills, and that the legislation is static in the House. The Senate, however, does not lack responsibility, since the legislation which would have brought the great archipelago of Hawaii into the Union was approved by the House. In the Eightieth Congress the Senate failed to take action.

As the sponsor of one of the bills which would bring about Alaskan Statehood, and as an advocate of statehood for both Territories, I wish to remind the Senate that in May of 1948 the President of the United States submitted a special message to the Congress, urging that Alaska be brought into the Union speedily. It is my further recollection that in January of this year the President gave his personal assurances to the Delegate from Hawaii of his interest in seeing Hawaiian statehood through. I submit that this Congress can take this action expeditiously, and go down in history as the one that admitted two great States to the Union.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HICKENLOOPER asked and obtained consent to be absent from the sessions of the Senate beginning tomorrow, through Monday next.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is now 6:15. We have had a rather long afternoon, and have accomplished a great deal. I do not believe we can do anything more today. So I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, August 4, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 3, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Acting Chaplain, Rev. James P. Wesberry, LL. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou, O Holy Father, hast been our Nation's help in ages past; Thou art her hope for years to come and her shelter from every stormy blast. Through Thine eternal goodness Thou hast laid her foundations of religious and civil liberty. Thou hast given to us a great and goodly heritage of faith, freedom, and heroic sacrifice. It is our humble petition that we may be true to these ideals upon which Thou hast founded and preserved our Nation. May our Nation ever be, as she has been so gloriously in the past, the home of liberty, brotherhood, and justice for all. And to this end we dedicate the opportunities of this day. In the name of Him who came that we, through Him, might have life and have it more abundantly we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4177. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. CORDON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1076. An act to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718b), as amended;

S. 1323. An act to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Pueblo Indians and the Canoncita Navajo group in New Mexico, and for other purposes; and

S. 1745. An act to authorize the transfer to the Attorney General of a portion of the Vigo plant, formerly the Vigo ordnance plant, near Terre Haute, Ind., to supplement the farm lands required for the United States prison system.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of

the House to the bill (S. 1250) entitled "An act to amend the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, Act, approved August 5, 1947," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McMAHON, Mr. GREEN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. LODGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE AND SUNDRY INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE BUREAUS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4177) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. THOMAS of Texas, GORE, ANDREWS, CANNON, CASE of South Dakota, and PHILLIPS of California.

LOWER SOURIS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3751) to transfer a tower located on the Lower Souris National Wildlife Refuge to the International Peace Garden, Inc., North Dakota, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. THOMPSON, HARE, and WEICHEL.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I was unavoidably detained and was not able to be present when the vote was taken on roll call 150. If I had been present I would have voted "yea."

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor may be permitted to sit today during the session of the House during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include two items.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an editorial and in the other an editorial from the Washington Post of July 21.

MUNICIPAL COURT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file a supplementary report on the bill (H. R. 1370) authorizing the appointment of three additional judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, describing the qualifications of appointees to the municipal court and the municipal court of appeals, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may be permitted to sit during the session of the House today during general debate.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is that agreeable to both sides?

Mr. PRIEST. I was asked to make the request. I checked with the gentleman from Michigan, who is a member of the committee, and I assume it is agreeable.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Health, Science, and Commerce of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be permitted to sit during the session of the House today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

CONTROL OF EMERGENCY OUTBREAKS OF INSECTS AND PLANT DISEASES

Mr. KERR submitted the following conference report and statement on the

joint resolution (H. J. Res. 327) making an additional appropriation for control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 1166)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 327) making an additional appropriation for control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
ELMER THOMAS,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
CHAN GURNEY,
GUY CORDON,
MILTON R. YOUNG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 327) making an additional appropriation for control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to such amendment, namely:

Appropriates \$1,750,000 for control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases instead of \$1,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on House Joint Resolution 327.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

MINIMUM-WAGE LEGISLATION

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable interest in the so-called flexibility feature of the minimum-wage legislation, and at the request of a number of Members I shall include in my remarks a table showing how changes in the cost of living would affect the minimum. There is a controversy as to the amount, whether it shall be 75 cents or 65 cents or some other amount, but in any event it seems to me that it should be governed by the cost of living. If we had had such a provision when the 1938 act was adopted, we would now have a minimum of around 54 cents on one formula or 65 cents on another formula, and we would be spared this unfortunate controversy as to whether or not it is to go to 75 cents, which, in my judgment, is too high.

How changes in the Consumers' Price Index would affect the minimum wage if sec. 6 of H. R. 4272 were adopted

The minimum wage will be—	When the index is—	Percent change in index from 170.2 (average for 12 months ending Oct. 15, 1948)
Cents	1938-39=100	
50	130.9	-23.1
51	135.5	-21.6
52	136.2	-20.0
53	138.8	-18.4
54	141.4	-16.9
55	144.0	-15.4
56	146.6	-13.9
57	149.3	-12.3
58	151.9	-10.8
59	154.5	-9.2
60	157.1	-7.7
61	159.7	-6.2
62	162.3	-4.6
63	165.0	-3.1
64	167.6	-1.5
65	170.2	0
66	172.8	1.5
67	175.4	3.1
68	178.1	4.6
69	180.7	6.2
70	183.3	7.7
71	185.9	9.2
72	188.5	10.8
73	191.1	12.3
74	193.8	13.9
75	196.4	15.4
76	199.0	16.9
77	201.6	18.4
78	204.2	20.0
79	206.9	21.6
80	209.5	23.1

¹ Proposed 1949 minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, the Legislative Reference Service has prepared a Public Affairs Bulletin entitled "The Question of a Flexible Statutory Minimum Wage." Gustav Peck, of the Library staff, has assembled all of the arguments, pro and con, for tying the minimum wage to the cost of living index. He also discusses other proposed methods for obtaining the necessary flexibility in a statutory minimum wage.

Mr. Peck's study will be of particular interest to Members who favor the principle of flexibility in minimum-wage legislation. When this legislation is considered by the House an amendment to the Lesinski bill establishing a rigid 75-cent minimum will be offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUCAS]. This amendment establishes the minimum at 65 cents but provides that it shall increase or decrease in relation to the consumer's price index. In no event shall the minimum be less than 50 cents an hour.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD the following excerpts from Mr. Peck's study:

The basic argument for a flexible minimum wage is the universal experience that prices and the cost of living do fluctuate and that a given amount of money—say, 75 cents per hour—has entirely different material content at different times. For instance, average hourly earnings in all manufacturing industries in 1938-39, when the 25-cent minimum rate became operative, were only 63 cents. The difference between those earnings and the average hourly earnings in the first half of 1949, which were \$1.37, is 74 cents per hour. But this does not mean that the real earnings of the average factory employee have more than doubled. About 70 percent of this increase represents the lower buying power of the dollar now as compared with 1939. Only 22 out of the 74-cent increase represents the increase in the goods and services available to the average factory worker after a period of 10 years. The reverse would be true if the cost of living were to go down to the level of 1938-39. If that were to happen and money wages were to remain fixed, there would be an increase of approximately 70 percent in the real income of wage earners.

The question is not whether the receipt of such an increase in real income would be a good or bad thing in itself but rather whether a 70-percent decline in prices (and some concomitant decline in production) could support the payment of 75 cents per hour for the least skilled and least experienced workers, when average workers earn traditionally twice the minimum and skilled workers and mechanics three to four times the minimum.

Pegging minimum wages at a relatively high level before a general and substantial decline in prices and the cost of living, has never been experienced since the establishment of minimum wages by States and by the Federal Government. Our whole experience has been with statutory (or wage board) minimum wages lagging behind rising prices and actual wages and the belated efforts of wage boards and the Congress to fix statutory minimum wages at some higher point at which competition and higher prices had already driven minimum wages in most establishments.

In all previous periods of recession wage rates have not gone down as much as prices. This is likely to be true in any future business recession. Under these conditions the purchasing power of prevailing wages actually increases while unemployment grows. If the money wage at the minimum is pegged by a fixed statutory minimum wage, the buying power of those still employed at that wage would be higher yet; but it is reasonable to surmise that the squeeze on employment between fixed money wages and declining prices would be greater. Only a reversal of the price trend would lessen the squeeze on employment. Assuming also that the relationship between wages at the minimum and above the minimum will not be greatly altered, the squeeze on employment would, of course, be felt among all classes of labor.

The theory of a statutory minimum wage is to take out of competition and make compulsory the payment of a wage to the least experienced and least efficient workers high enough to enable them to purchase the common necessities of life. In State legislation a list of these necessities is agreed upon and then they are priced to determine the amount of money required to purchase these items. The minimum wage is set at this figure. The Federal law proceeded by less direct methods; but this too purported to establish a basic standard of real goods and services. The standards adopted are necessarily modest because it is not desired to

[PUBLIC LAW 215—81ST CONGRESS]

[CHAPTER 407—1ST SESSION]

[H. J. Res. 327]

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making an additional appropriation for control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sum is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

For an additional amount for "Control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases", \$1,750,000.

Approved August 8, 1949.

